

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 21, 1868.

THE PRESIDENT, Vice-President, and Council of the Incorporated Law Society entertained a distinguished party composed of members of the legal profession, at dinner at the hall of the Society, on Wednesday last. The guests included the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins, the Hon. Sir Geo. Etienne Cartier, Bart., minister of her Majesty's Council of Canada, Mr. Justice Hayes, Mr. Baron Cleasby, and others. In responding to the toast of the President, in honour of the learned judges present, the Lord Chief Justice expressed his disapprobation of a proposition recently made for the amalgamation of the two branches of the legal profession.

WE ARE INFORMED that, in consequence of the decision of the Court of Common Pleas in the case of *Holborn v. Jones* (*supra*, 21, reported in the *Weekly Reporter* to-day), in which the Court allowed costs, although less than £20 had been recovered, Mr. Pitt Taylor has ordered that in his courts, Lambeth, Greenwich, and Woolwich, summonses may issue, under the Bills of Exchange Act, for sums over £10, instead of over £20 as heretofore. To have summonses issued under the Act it is necessary to make special application, otherwise they will be issued in the ordinary way. The decision mentioned will produce uniformity of practice in all the county courts on a point hitherto differently decided by different judges to the frequent inconvenience of suitors and the profession.

A CURIOUS QUESTION as to the jurisdiction of the English criminal courts was decided last Monday by the Court for Crown Cases Reserved. An American, James Anderson by name, on board a vessel from Nova Scotia, registered in London, murdered a British subject while the vessel was in the river Garonne, in France. He was tried for the murder here, and Byles, J., reserved the question for the Court of Criminal Appeal. The Court decided that the prisoner was properly tried in England, as the crime had been committed on board an English vessel. We believe this point has not been before decided. There are many reported cases respecting the liability for crimes committed on English vessels, but most of these cases have arisen out of acts done whilst the vessel was on the high seas. Here the difficulty was caused by the fact that the murder was in France, and was by an American, not an English citizen.

APPROPOS of the recent appointment of four Scotch Q.C.s, we are informed that, although these gentlemen have received their patents, and have been gazetted, they have not yet been sworn in; and as to their forensic garb they are just as before, Messrs. Moncrieff and Young wearing their stuff gowns. The Lord Advocate and Solicitor-General always wear silk gowns, and of course have a special rank of their own as the Scotch Law Officers of the Crown. When they go out of office they can now, under their patents as Q.C.s, retain their silk gowns, and it is to be hoped they will. There are other learned gentlemen at the Scotch bar who might also have fairly claimed promotion, as, for instance, Messrs Clark and Fraser, but these gentlemen are disqualified, in consequence of their being sheriffs of counties, an office incompatible with the rank of Queen's Counsel.

THE BOROUGH ELECTIONS are now over; the county contests are to come, and the country has not yet got clear of the smoke and the din of such an election as has never been since that on which hung the fate of the Reform Bill of 1832. Amid the hubbub, however,

we may glance at the results as far as the lawyers are concerned. There has been a rather remarkable slaughter in high quarters. The Attorney and Solicitor-General both, Mr. Lawson, Attorney-General for Ireland to the late Government, Mr. Garth, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. E. K. Karlake, and Mr. Roebuck, all left out in the cold; Mr. O'Malley, the leader of the Norfolk Circuit, was also rejected. On the other hand, of notables returned, we have Sir Roundell Palmer, Mr. J. D. Coleridge, the Hon. G. Denman, Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Sir Robert Collier, Mr. Jessel, and Mr. Hinde Palmer, of the Chancery Bar, Mr. Russell Gurney, Mr. Thomas Chambers, Sergeant Sullivan, of the Irish Bar, and Mr. Staveley Hill.

Of the solicitors, Mr. Carter, formerly solicitor to the Midland Railway Company, Mr. Freshfield, Mr. Tillett, and Mr. Baxter are unsuccessful; Mr. Merriman retired; while Mr. Joseph Dodds, Mr. G. Hodgkinson, and Mr. G. Goldney are returned.

For the rest we must refer the reader to our list, which appears in another column. We may add that the Attorney-General is not now, at any rate, as we have seen it stated, standing for Middlesex.

THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS on Thursday disposed of the case of *Baxter v. Langley*, the St. Martin's Hall case. The question was, whether the "Sunday Evenings for the People" of January, 1867, came within the 21 Geo. 3, c. 49,—"An Act for Preventing certain Abuses and Profanations on the Lord's Day" That Act recites that—

"Whereas, certain houses, rooms, or places within the cities of London and Westminster, or in the neighbourhood thereof, have of late been frequently opened for public entertainment or amusement upon the evening of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, and at other houses, rooms, or places within the said cities, or in the neighbourhood thereof, under pretence of inquiring into religious doctrines and explaining texts of Holy Scripture, debates have frequently been held on the evening of the Lord's Day concerning texts of Holy Scripture by persons unlearned and incompetent to explain the same, to the corruption of good morals, and to the great encouragement of irreligion and profaneness."

and then enacts:—

"That from and after the passing of this Act any house, room, or other place which shall be opened or used for public entertainment or amusement, or for publicly debating on any subject whatsoever, upon any part of the Lord's Day called Sunday, and to which persons shall be admitted by payment of money, or by tickets sold for money, shall be deemed a disorderly house or place; and the keeper of such house, room, or place shall forfeit the sum of £200 for every day that such house, room, or place shall be opened or used as aforesaid on the Lord's Day, to such person as will sue for the same, and be otherwise punishable as the law directs."

Mr. Langley was at the head of an association of gentlemen calling themselves "Recreative Religionists." Their object appears to have been to diffuse religious feeling by means of the programmes which they carried out; not, be it observed, merely to gain attention for religious services or religious instruction, by means of additaments of an entertaining character, such as music or lectures.

What the Association did was this:—They registered St. Martin's Hall for public worship, and held meetings on Sunday evenings, money being taken at the doors, merely, however, towards defraying the expenses. At these meetings sacred music was performed, and addresses, sometimes of a religious and at others of a merely instructive character were delivered. There was no prayer; hymns, however, and poems were circulated amongst the audience,—not always devotional, as the Court observed, but occasionally expressing adoration of the Deity. There was no debating, and nothing tending to encourage immorality or irreligion. The

"Recreative Religionists" were admittedly acting from the purest motives, and doing so at a considerable pecuniary sacrifice. On the other hand, these proceedings against them were honestly undertaken, in the belief that these "Sunday evenings for the people" were harmful and wrong as desecrations of the Sabbath, to try the question whether they were not illegal.

The plaintiff contended that the registration of the place for public worship was a mere colourable pretence to evade the Act,—that in point of fact these meetings were *not* held for worship. Upon this ground the Court decides for the defendant, saying that this was a question for the Court to draw an inference from the facts, and that the inference the Court drew was that the meetings were honestly intended for "worship," though not according to the established usage.

Having got thus far it seems, in our view, unnecessary for the Court to have decided that these "religious services," for such it had held them to be, were not entertainments or amusements. The Court goes on, however, to say:—"The addresses" (we quote from a newspaper report) "were always instructive, and amusing elements often introduced, but the greatest preachers, such as Bishop Latimer and Bishop South, did not hesitate to adopt a similar course when it was necessary to illustrate the subject or to fix the attention. The objects of the promoters of the association were to advance their own views of religion. None but sacred music was performed. The discourses were intended to be instructive, and, as they said, to make 'science the handmaid of religion,' and they were not hostile to religion; and, in the opinion of the Court, the services did not fall within the meaning of the phrases 'entertainment' or 'amusement' in the statute."

The *ratio decidendi* we understand, then, to be that the Act does not apply to places opened for "worship;" and, the Court holding that the worship need not be that of the State religion, and having regard to the nature of the "services" performed in this case, it seems to flow from this decision that "worship," to exclude the operation of the Act, need not consist in adoration; but that the condition of worship is fulfilled by any system of instruction designed directly (indirectly, as by the sole means of secular education, might not be enough) to lead the audience to a better attitude towards the Supreme Being.

THE NEW YORK PENAL CODE comprises every branch of the criminal law of that State, together with elaborate prison regulations, but does not include criminal procedure or the law of evidence. These subjects are contained in other codes. The Penal Code consists of one thickish large octavo volume. In common with its fellow codes, it is elaborately divided and subdivided into titles, chapters, and sections, with notes appended. The sections are never more than a few lines in length, and great care has been taken to employ throughout that brief, sententious language which seems to be regarded as the necessary characteristic of a code.

We subjoin a single section (section 241) as an example:—"Homicide is murder in the following cases,—1. When perpetrated without authority of law, and with a premeditated design to effect the death of the person killed, or of any other human being. 2. When perpetrated by any act criminally dangerous to others, and evincing a depraved mind, regardless of human life, although without any premeditated design to effect the death of any particular individual. 3. When perpetrated, without any design to effect death, by a person engaged in the commission of a felony."

To frame a penal code is, of course, a comparatively easy task. The most determined opponents of innovation probably admit that codification is so far practicable. Our formidable difficulties begin when we approach the question of a *civil* code. Still, even a penal code is no easy matter, and presents abundant obstacles

to success. These obstacles Mr. Dudley Field and his colleagues have skilfully overcome. They have constructed a very fair penal code, not unworthy of the great State under whose auspices it has been produced; though hardly equal to such a masterpiece as our own Indian Code promises to be, if we may judge of it from those portions which are already complete.

The Penal Code of New York has been laid before the Legislature in a complete form, but has not yet become law. Inasmuch, however, as its provisions, with a few exceptions, are mere embodiments of the substance of the existing law, the code presents us with a very fair exposition of the *existing* criminal law of the State of New York. In fact, though not yet in force as a code, it already serves the purpose of a digest. This criminal law of New York is primarily derived from our own, and is in most respects identical with it. In some points, however, changes have been introduced. Some of these are important; others curious—at least, to English eyes. A glance at the Penal Code may, therefore, be both instructive and interesting. We premise that in all the points hereafter mentioned, except where it is otherwise stated, the Penal Code only embodies existing provisions of the law of New York. We are not in the habit of considering the Americans a very strait-laced people, yet it is remarkable how often offences against morality, to which our criminal law does not extend, are prohibited by theirs. Thus, sections 38—51 of the Penal Code forbid Sabbath-breaking; under which head almost every kind of Sunday travelling is included. Contrast this with our Sunday excursion trains! Again, seduction for the purpose of prostitution is punishable by imprisonment for five years; as also is seduction under promise of marriage, unless the parties have subsequently married. Incest is similarly punishable (section 341) Betting or gaming to the amount of twenty-five dollars or upwards is a criminal offence punishable by fine: though enactments of this kind seem not to be very rigidly enforced. The laws against drunkenness seem to be much the same as our own, with one or two curious additions. Mr. Abel Smith's bill has been anticipated in New York. All publicans selling strong drinks on Sunday are guilty of a misdemeanour (section 728); and the same penalty attaches to persons selling or giving away spirituous liquors on an election day. Moreover, it is a criminal offence to sell drinks at any time to a habitual drunkard (section 726). What would the great publican interest in this country say to such proposals? Another provision of a similar nature is still more curious. It is competent to a wife to request any publican or other person not to sell drink to her husband; and on that mere request being made without more, the publican is prohibited from selling drink to the husband, on pain of a fine and of becoming for ever incapable of holding a license (section 726).

It is proposed by the Code Commission that the exemption of a wife from punishment on account of acts done in her husband's presence should be considerably limited. According to the code as now drawn, such presence is no excuse in the cases, not only of treason and murder, but of abortion, keeping a bawdy-house, obscene exhibitions of books or prints, and other offences.

It is instructive at the present time to observe that, according to New York law, the administering, though not the receiving, of bribes at elections is a misdemeanour (sections 61 *et. seq.*). So, also, is treating, intimidation of any kind, and even the carriage of voters to the poll.

A peculiar feature of the New York law is the introduction of what we may call *minimum* terms of imprisonment, for serious offences. Thus a person found guilty of rape may be sentenced to any term of imprisonment *exceeding* five years; but he cannot be sentenced for a *less* term. And the same in certain other cases. This is an innovation which we do not admire. However serious the offence may be, it may occasionally happen that circumstances mitigate the crime to a very

large extent. And in such cases a *minimum* term of imprisonment might press with much hardship. It would also operate in practice as an obstacle in the way of a conviction wherever there were mitigating circumstances. On the whole we think that the discretionary power given by our law to the judge is right in principle; and we should regret to see it exchanged for any Procrustean rule whatsoever. The adulteration of food is made a misdemeanour (section 451); though we do not quite understand whether this is a repetition of an existing law, or is merely a proposal of the Code Commission.

The existence of a state of society more lawless than our own is indicated by section 455, which makes it a misdemeanour to carry concealed weapons, while the mere manufacture or sale of "slung shot" is in itself a criminal offence (section 453). Section 469 contains a somewhat notable provision. It is thereby made a misdemeanour to make or publish any false statement or rumour in order to rig the market. Another stringent enactment is contained in section 520, which provides that every person making a false statement or return, whether written or oral, as the basis of taxation, shall be liable to the penalties of a misdemeanour.

The New York Code contains a provision directed against birdnesting; this applies, however, only to birdnesting in cemeteries (section 702); but with regard to this particular species of sport, its provisions are exceedingly precise. Not only is birdnesting, or the catching or killing of birds in cemeteries prohibited; but it is a criminal offence to buy or sell any birds so captured. It seems, from a survey of this Code, that the New York criminal law is, or is capable of being, more stringent than our own; it certainly descends somewhat further into detail.

A CORRESPONDENT last week drew attention to the remarkably unsatisfactory state into which the law as to registered judgments has now finally been brought by the Act of 1864 (27 & 28 Vict. c. 112). He suggests that since, except to the first judgment-creditor who happens to deliver his writ to the sheriff, this registration is now of no use to the creditors or anyone else; this dead letter of the law had better be abolished; and, in lieu, the sheriff empowered to sell real property as he would any other description.

It must be confessed that these Judgment Acts are as unsatisfactory a mess as can be. It is impossible to interpret them rationally. Before 1860 priority dated according to registration; registration had to be repeated every five years, the effect of not re-registering being that priority was lost as against an *interim* purchaser for value, but not as against subsequent judgments, though duly re-registered. Then comes the Act of 1860, and curtails the effect of registration, by enacting that no judgment entered up after that Act shall affect land as to a purchaser for value or mortgagee, unless execution be registered before the conveyance. And by the same Act, execution must be put in force within three months of registry. Then we have the Act of 1864, which Vice-Chancellors Wood and Giffard concurred in regarding as most ill-constructed: this Act enacts that no judgment entered up after the Act "shall affect any land until the land shall have been actually delivered in execution." As Vice-Chancellor Wood, in *Re Cambridge Railway Company*, 16 W. R. 506, said, it is very difficult to make sense of the various sections of this Act. Omitting this difficulty, however, and retiring to what has been actually settled as the effect of the Act, Vice-Chancellor Giffard, in *Guest v. Cambridge Railway Company*, 17 W. R. 17 says that priorities will be according to the order in which the writs were delivered to the sheriff, and that no person has any lien on the land who has not got a return from the sheriff to his writ. The decision of Vice-Chancellor Wood looks, on the face of it, as though the present Lord Justice meant to lay down that no creditor could petition under the Act for a sale, except the active man

who had actually got the land delivered to him, excluding all the others. Vice-Chancellor Giffard, however, interprets Sir W. P. Wood's decision to mean that an actual return from the sheriff is enough to entitle a judgment-creditor to petition for a sale—that any one of them may so petition as soon as he has got a return to his writ. On this point Sir W. P. Wood and Sir G. M. Giffard seem to us to be at variance.

Then our correspondent, Mr. Tagart, says that he has never yet met with an instance in which a creditor entitled to petition under the Act has done so with any advantage to himself. We should be glad if other correspondents would favour us with their experience on this matter. As to such judgment creditors as may not be entitled to petition, Vice-Chancellor Wood observed that after pushing their judgments to the furthest limit they could attain at common law, they could file their bills in chancery (citing *Turner, V.C. in Smith v. Hurst*, 10 Ha. 48). But the quality of the relief attainable by such a bill is very doubtful. Mr. Tagart, supported by another correspondent this week, says, "Why should not the sheriff sell freeholds?" We believe that in America he does so: the difficulty, however, which occurs to us is as to the title. At present no incumbrancer need consent to a sale unless he pleases. Would it be well practically to force his consent?

One thing seems clear, that since mere registration is now a dead letter, it had better be abolished.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE REGISTRAR OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

The report which the indefatigable Mr. Tidd Pratt issues every year has always this bright side, that the large number of Friendly Societies of which it tells, with their vast aggregate of members, shows so enormous a mass of poor persons striving by some sacrifice from their present earnings to secure a provision for the future. For, however sad may be the tale which closer examination has to tell of mismanagement and worse, the subscribing members, by whose payments these societies are maintained with funds, are actuated solely by prudential motives.

We have now before us Mr. John Tidd Pratt's report for the year 1867, from which we learn that during the year 1867 the Registrar has examined and certified the rules of 1,134 friendly societies, and also the alterations of the rules of 1,542, making a total of 2,676 certificates. The Registrar in Ireland has certified the rules of 22 societies, and 35 amendments of rules. The number of co-operative societies certified by the Registrar in England in the year 1867 was 137; in Ireland, 2. The Registrar in Scotland has not stated the number of rules or amendments which he has certified in 1867. Thirty-four societies have deposited their rules with the Registrar under 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, s. 44. Notices of dissolution have been received from 185 friendly societies; of which number 82 were advertised in the *London Gazette*, pursuant to 23 & 24 Vict. c. 58, s. 3.

By 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, and 23 & 24 Vict. c. 58, the officers of societies are required to transmit to the Registrar, once every year, a general statement of the funds and effects of the society, or a copy of its last general report. This return must be made by the 1st of June in each year, under a penalty not exceeding £1 on each officer making default. In December, 1867, the Registrar sent out 23,174 forms for this annual return; only 11,408 returns, however, had been received previous to the 1st of July, 1868. We may presume that the number of forms issued by the Registrar represents the number of societies of whose existence he has knowledge, and this being so, and allowing for the 182 societies whose dissolution was duly announced to him, there remain upwards of 11,000 societies which have rendered no account of their stewardship. It is very probable that, from a desire to make no omissions, the number of forms issued may somewhat exceed the number of societies to make

the return; but, allowing for this, and allowing for societies which may have been dissolved without the notice to the Registrar, and without the observance of the safeguards provided by the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, there must still be several thousands of societies which disobey the enactment and furnish no return to the Registrar.

Of the societies which make returns, some do not state the number of members, others omit the amount of their funds, while in nearly 400 instances returns were furnished without the name of the society or the place where held; with such neglect, wilful or otherwise, are the returns prepared. The total number of members indicated by the returns made is 1,647,814, and the total of funds £7,095,537, or about £4 7s. per member, roughly.

£4 7s. of assets per member is not a very large amount, but we are not prepared to say that it is too small for an average, including burial societies, in which the assurances are mostly very small in amount. But it seems probable that if all the returns were accurately obtained this average would be reduced: it is no unfair assumption to conclude that the cases in which the returns are withheld are those in which, if furnished, they would prove least satisfactory.

The dark side of the whole matter is that from various causes which bring themselves within the ken of the Registrar, it so very often happens that those who lay up their money with these societies do not get the return due to their prudence. It sometimes happens that the widow or the sick member cannot obtain payment on the happening of the contingency insured against. Since his last report the Registrar has received, "numerous and almost daily complaints from parties who cannot obtain payment of their claims from burial societies. Sometimes the society is so far insolvent that it cannot pay, especially if, as must and will sometimes occur, many deaths or illnesses happen to crowd together at one period. Or the management of the society is irregular, the proper formalities have not been complied with, the insurer was not properly admitted as a member, and the society, having taken the money all along, refuses to acknowledge the claim. Of course the insurers ought to insist on having everything done in due form, but the officers who neglect to protect them are far more to blame.

From a return for 1866, it appears that in thirty-four societies whose statistics are there given, the aggregate of members is 1,127,473, and the aggregate of funds £274,919, or about four shillings and elevenpence per member! A sad picture enough,—more than a million of poor people paying their weekly or monthly subscriptions, as the case may be, and receiving nothing in return, but an assurance of sick pay and burial or death insurance money, guaranteed only by an exchequer which, if divided, would, on its own showing, realize less than five shillings apiece. The reason of all this insolvency appears to be the exorbitant amounts of the expenses. In the same return with the thirty-four societies above-mentioned are four others, the Wiltshire, County of Kent and Hampshire Friendly Societies, and the Mutual Providence Alliance, which, with an aggregate of 22,879 members show assets to the amount of £163,079, or about £7 3s. per member. In these four societies the expenses are very much smaller in proportion than in the other thirty-four, showing how cause and effect work in this matter. Turning to some other statistics, illustrative of the same evil, the readers of this journal may remember (vide 11 S. J. 249) that at the beginning of this year Mr. Tidd Pratt published some "Observations on Friendly Societies for payment at death," from which, shortly after publication, we made some extracts. From this paper it appeared that in one of the largest friendly societies in the kingdom, the Royal Liver, the management expenses were 15s. 1d. for every £1 spent in relief. In another, the Victoria Legal Sick Society (Birmingham), the cost of management was £3 for every £1 spent in relief; in the Victoria Legal (Liverpool), £1; in the

United Legal (Liverpool), 16s.; and, lumping together the statistics of ten burial societies, it appeared that the funds in hand were only £67,267, or about 2s. 10d. per insurer, while the amount insured must, according to the registrar's computation, exceed £1,500,000.*

This enormous proportion of working expenses to work done seems attributable in chief to collection expenses and large official salaries. Against the former we have no more to say than that in a large number of cases they might surely be kept lower. In the Royal Liver Society for instance, among others, it appears that the collection of members' subscriptions costs 25 per cent. of their amount. Where small weekly payments have to be collected, the expenses of collection must inevitably (except in the very smallest local societies, in which they may be very light†) be rather heavy;—this cannot be avoided, but we do not see that they need amount to 15, 20, or 25 per cent. of the amount collected. It has been said, in defence of the societies' expenses on this head, that it is much better for a working man paying twopence a-week to his society, to pay the collector a halfpenny of it for calling at his door, than to walk some distance himself, perhaps passing several public houses on the way. There is something in this; but how often can the collector call, and may not the twopence burn in the working man's pocket in the meanwhile? Twenty-five per cent. is a very heavy tax on prudence, and there are the management expenses and official salaries behind. As to the payment to officials, and other expenses, the extravagance is here frequently gross, all the worse because the managers are those who pay themselves. In the Royal Liver Friendly Society, in which the total expenses are 40 per cent. on the receipts (the rules permit of their being at 55 per cent.), eight committee-men receive salaries of £454 a-piece, though it seemed that on one occasion two of these individuals proved unequal to the task of writing decent grammar and spelling in a brief letter. While speaking of expenses we may quote the following:—

"The registrar is receiving daily complaints from the members of the lodges of several societies, stating that the members of such lodges have an idea, provided they carry a resolution by a majority of the members at a general meeting, that they can make and pass what laws they think fit respecting the attendance of the members at the anniversary dinner, joining processions, and paying a share towards the expenses of excursions, &c., or inflicting fines on members for not complying with such resolutions. It should be clearly understood that no such resolution is legally binding on any member, neither can it be enforced. No rule is binding on the members of a lodge until such rule has been duly certified by the registrar, who, since the passing of the 18 & 19 Vict. c. 63, cannot legalise any compulsory payment for beer, or any of the expenses above mentioned."

In reference also to this subject of expenditure, the following extract from the report of an Investigation Committee of the Ancient Order of Foresters is worth noticing. The Committee say:—

"It is with regret we have to state, that although this subject has on previous occasions been brought before the notice of various high court meetings, the laws are very frequently violated, and, in many instances, we have reason to believe systematically evaded by charging an extortionate amount as rental of court-room. We also find that large sums of money have been taken from the management funds for the carrying out of anniversaries, processions, &c., and we trust the evil will be remedied in future."

These charges for rental of court-room, which are thus condemned, are of this nature. The rules of the

* It seems possible, however, to us that these latter figures may, on a cursory reading, slightly exaggerate the amount of insolvency; as a certain proportion of the liability must be for sick benefit, which will only fall due on an ascertainable percentage of insurances, and we do not understand from the report whether or no these liabilities are included in the estimated million and a half.

† A small Scotch society at Dairy has no collectors or agents whatever—number of members, 495; funds, £1,946; contributions, £314; total management expenses, only £20; or about £6 per cent.

society not allowing its funds to be subjected to charges for beer, &c., supplied at court meetings, the prohibition was evaded by an arrangement with the publican in whose house the meetings were held, under which he, being allowed an excessive sum for use of room, returned the excess in liquor; and thus the thirsty souls at the meeting were gratified with drink at the expense of the society's funds without showing on the accounts a charge so singularly *ultra vires* of the ostensible objects of the institution. It is much to the credit of the Foresters that, after a somewhat stormy debate, this practice was emphatically condemned and prohibited. The Manchester Unity Society have adopted the same wise course, at which the registrar rejoices greatly, he having "for nearly forty years been endeavouring to induce all friendly societies" to do the like. It is cheering to find societies thus taking up their own cause; far more satisfactory than having it done for them from the outside.

When, however, we look at the determined dislike on the part of many societies (as represented, of course, by their managers) to having the light of publicity thrown upon their management and their accounts, and the aversion with which Mr. Tidd Pratt's proceedings are too often regarded, the aspect of affairs becomes the reverse of cheering. See for instance the following extract from Mr. Tidd Pratt's observations:—

"The registrar has received several anonymous and other communications respecting his observations on friendly burial societies threatening actions, &c.; he begs the writers, whether committee-men, treasurers, secretaries, collectors, or agents of such societies, to understand that, as long as he holds the office of registrar, he considers it will be his duty, and in which he will not fail, to expose the frauds which are, in his opinion, committed by the majority of those societies on the working classes, by the extravagant salaries paid to the committee, treasurers, officers, collectors, and agents, and the omission to publish any statement of their assets and liabilities; as, in his opinion, it would be more beneficial to the members to deposit their contributions in a savings bank, particularly with respect to endowments, than to pay them to the agents or collectors of such societies. After these remarks, it will not be the registrar's fault if the working classes subscribing to such societies do not receive the benefits they have so dearly paid for."

Witness also the determined opposition made to the Earl of Lichfield's Friendly Societies Bill in the present year by the managers of these societies. The bill, which aimed at the protection of the members from mismanagement and misappropriation, found no favour with those who preferred managing their constituents' matters in the dark, and after their own fashion; the result was a struggle among the officers to oppose it, and circulars were sent round to agents, urging them to get signatures to petitions against it.

We find again that frequent informalities and irregularities are committed, in consequence of which subscribers are often much inconvenienced, even to the loss of the actual benefit, such as it is, accruing from their subscriptions. Members are sometimes transferred from one society to another without their consent. Sometimes the subscriber is not admitted a member "according to the rules," in which case he gets no legal claim as an insurer. Again, "the parties insured have generally no form of policy given to them, but merely a card, on which is entered their weekly payments." All this mismanagement and the waste of funds deprives the poor hard-working insurers of a very large percentage of the money which they entrust to these societies: that is bad enough, but when we remember that this proportion of loss operates as a direct tax upon prudence and thrift, and furnishes a ready excuse for present self-indulgence, the matter becomes sadder still. The press, the clergy, and others may do much by impressing on working people the prudence of joining no society without first satisfying themselves of its solvency, remembering that the registrar, in certifying the rules, does not, in any way, vouch for the society's solvency, or the respectability of its officers. But it is impossible to expect that, as

affairs are now managed, a working man or woman will have the opportunity or ability "by an inspection of an actuary's report" to inform his or her mind sufficiently on this head. It is also much to be wished that no gentlemen would lend their names, as directors or otherwise, to societies, as a matter of mere form, but would be at the pains to ascertain, from time to time, that the management merits a sensible man's approval.

Mr. Tidd Pratt, in the course of his report, gives statistics of the Post Office Savings Banks and Government Insurances and Annuities, from which it appears that these institutions are becoming exceedingly popular. The total number of savings bank depositors has now increased from 1,304,000 to 2,156,290, which gives the surprisingly large proportion of one depositor to every fourteen persons in the United Kingdom, taking the two years 1866—7 together. The average of deposits in the old savings banks was £4 to £5, the average in the post office banks was at first £3 to £4 and is now £2 10s. to £3, from which it seems that the benefits of the system are recommending themselves to the poorer strata of our working population. It seems also that, contrasted with the burial societies, the Government insurances shew to an advantage, as regards the interest of the assured. For instance, a monthly payment of 1s. 1d. would insure on death £8 6s. 8d. from the Post Office, £8 from the Loyal Philanthropic Society, £7 from the Victoria Legal, and £6 from the Royal Liver. There seems, therefore, an advantage in saving or insuring through the Post Office; besides the very important consideration that the Post Office Bank is as safe or safer than the Bank of England, while most societies are anything but secure, and that the Government makes no exorbitant deduction for officers' salaries or collection expenses. On the other hand the Post Office, though it grants old age and death insurances, does not insure payments on sickness, against which workers are naturally desirous to provide.

We have now shown the present position and operation of the system by the help of the registrar's report. It is natural enough that the poor should prefer to lay up their money in mutual societies rather than deal wholly with the Government through the Post Office, and it is perhaps well that this should be so. But it is pretty evident that they need some better protection than the law can yet give them. Penalties, as the Registrar finds, are of little service, because the managers have practically the funds of the societies at their own disposal. He is no doubt right in saying that, as things now are, working people are better provided for by the Post Office than by the societies, and if, as he anticipates, the Postmaster is soon empowered to grant assurances as low as £5 (the present inferior limit is £20), the Post Office, no doubt, will receive a large increase of business. This is very excellent, and it will be still more excellent if the Legislature passes some such bill as that introduced by Earl Lichfield, and so helps these people to help themselves, by assisting them to well-conducted mutual societies. We trust at some future time to discuss the means by which this is to be effected.

LIBERTY OF THE PRESS IN FRANCE.

No. I.

The short time that has elapsed since the promulgation of the new law of the press in France has given sufficient opportunities for judging of its operation, and the manner in which it has fulfilled the liberal promise which it was to realize, and an analysis of its principal clauses, will show us how laws, not bad in themselves, may work evil from the infirmity of the institutions through which they are enforced. But as an introduction to this account of the new law, a rapid sketch of the history of the press in France, since the revolution of 1789, may be interesting to those who are not aware of the inclemency of the climate of France to the liberty of the press, and the difficulties

which have met the efforts of those who have tried to rear on the soil of that country a plant that thrives so vigorously in others.

The liberty of the press was among the numerous rights of the subject which, having been entirely ignored by the old *regime*, it was deemed necessary to proclaim in the celebrated declaration of the rights of man which was attached as preamble to the Constitution of 1791, and of which the 11th article was as follows:—"The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the most precious rights of man: every citizen may, therefore, speak, write, print without restraint, subject to the necessity of answering for the abuse of such liberty in the cases provided for by the law." The law of the press which was to follow the constitution was never made, but very soon the theoretically unrestrained liberty of the citizens was mitigated, in practice, to a very serious degree. They were perfectly free to publish their opinions, no bureau of censorship was there to castigate them, but the cudgel was ready for their backs, and the bonfire for their writings, if they displeased the governing faction. They were called up before the Commune de Paris, or a section, or a club, or even before a quorum of patriots, *habitués* of a café, who sat upon their articles, deputed delegates to admonish them to mend their ways, or with all the seriousness in the world, condemned the papers that were found wanting, to be trampled upon, or consigned them to the flames or to the chiffonnier's basket. Happy those papers who suffered nothing worse than such school-boy trials, whose presses were not seized upon to be given to patriot journalists, or whose writers were not arrested and executed under the law of the suspected, by the *comité du salut public*. This system of unregulated liberty, thus tempered by the guillotine, continued till the time of the Directory, when was enacted (on the 28th Germinal, year IV., A.D. 1796) the first law framed since the Revolution to regulate the press.

That law, which was not entirely abrogated till 1830, established certain provisions analogous to those existing in this country, to settle the responsibility of offences, and secure the punishment of offenders: for example, an enactment requiring the printer to put his name and address on every production issued from his press. The essential principles were left unviolated, no preventive means adopted, but certain offences, such as attacks against the constitution, visited with terrible penalties. The government of the Directory, however, found this law insufficient for their protection; they had recourse to those spasmodic displays of violence and arbitrary power which seem chronic in France, and under which they were soon to fall. The journalists of the opposition, "*those vile conspirators whose existence was an accusation against nature*," to use the language of the official documents, were arrested *en masse*, and transported to what seemed their fitting abode, "the land inhabited by tigers." That meant Cayenne, where tigers are not found. The journalists, however, and other political enemies then transported to that country, were, alas, soon enough devoured by the climate, which even the hard and ferocious nature of such ruthless monsters could not stand. The Directory continued the same system of lawless violence, till Bonaparte, by the *coup d'état* of the 18th Brumaire swept them away.

Thus was the liberty of the press practised during the short period which elapsed between its first recognition in France and the appearance of Bonaparte at the head of the Government. He made it his business to demonstrate that it was possible for the press to fare even worse than under the Convention and Directory. Till then the liberty of the press had been recognised as a principle, and every one might publish a book or a paper without authorisation and restraint. By an *arrêté* or decree of the 27th Nivose, year VIII. (January, 1800), the Consuls suppressed all the newspapers published in the department

of the Seine, except thirteen; prohibited the creation of any others, ordered the directors of the authorized papers to take an oath of fidelity to the constitution, and declared that any paper publishing any article offending against the "glory of the armies," and sundry other equally sacred things, should be immediately suppressed. This *arrêté* was to be repealed when a general peace should be concluded. It remained in vigour to the end of the Empire. Subsequently the number of political papers tolerated in Paris was reduced to four. In each of the departments only one political paper was allowed, subject to the authorisation and inspection of the prefect. The number of literary, agricultural, and advertisement papers were likewise fixed, also the price of the advertisements. An office for the supervision and inspection of the papers was established in Paris, under the name of *Bureau de l'esprit public*.

By an *arrêté* of the 12th Vendémiaire, year XII. (4th October, 1803), all booksellers were prohibited from vending any book without having submitted it to the censure, and as if to add insult to injury, the measure was introduced as one "to secure the liberty of the press." That liberty received no better recognition during the whole of the reign of the Emperor, previous to the "hundred days." It received its death blow in the decree of the 5th February, 1810. The preparation of that decree brought on in the Council of State a most curious discussion, which showed what way had been made since 1789, and how, as has been exemplified by a recent and similar case, the servants go beyond the master in what they conceive to be his interest. Napoleon, in a series of most characteristic remarks, laid down the doctrine that the principles of his constitution necessarily excluded the liberty of the press, which, said he, in substance, could be of no application in a system where the people had nothing to say in the affairs of the nation, but must, as a matter of course, exist where the nation were supposed to have a hand in their own affairs. The uncle does not seem to have been followed by the nephew in his view of this branch of the question. Napoleon I., however, did not consider true liberty of the press as possible among Frenchmen, "who have a lively imagination," as it is in England, where the "people being brutal are less likely to be influenced by writings, and are more easily kept in check by the throne and the aristocracy." The decree that issued from these deliberations, and which bears the date of the 5th of February, 1810, was certainly very well calculated for preventing the press from inflaming the fancy of the French people. All productions of the press, whether periodical or not, whatever their character and extent, were to be submitted to the censors. The interdiction by these to be absolute, their approval no safeguard, since, that notwithstanding, the minister of police might subsequently to the publication seize upon the work at any moment he might please, whatever the loss to the publisher. It is true there was a recourse to the Council of State from the decision of the minister, but those who are acquainted with French institutions are well aware what that might be worth as a means of redress—an appeal from Philip tipsy to Philip drunk. Lastly, as a further check upon the press, the booksellers and printers were required to obtain licenses, to take an oath to the government, and the number of the printers was limited. Such were the main features of the decree of the 5th February, 1810, some of which are traceable in the present law. As a climax, in the course of 1811 a proposal was made to license circulating libraries, give them only to authorised booksellers "of unexceptionable character," and require the catalogues to be submitted for expurgation to a functionary called *directeur de la librairie*. But the good sense of the master would not allow him to go such lengths in absurdity; Napoleon refused to sanction such a measure, and it was accordingly nipped in the bud.

Such is the law which ruled till the Hundred Days. The assembly which went by the name of Senate, whose duty was, by the express behests of the Constitution, to check such laws, let this pass unnoticed. They recollected it, however, when the master was laid low, in time to give the fallen lion a parting kick; and in the decree of the 3rd of April, 1814, they pronounced that Napoleon had forfeited the throne for having submitted the liberty of the press, "which had been established as one of the rights of the nation," to the constant and arbitrary censure of the police;—thus proving, contrary to the French saw, that, at least, in the practice of assemblies of this character, silence does not mean consent.

Louis XVIII. came, full of promises, and, by the 18th article of the constitutional charter, granted by him to the French, it was declared that "the French have the right to publish and print their opinions, subject to the laws which punish the abuse of such liberty," but shortly a law was presented (that of the 14th of October), by which all books and newspapers were to be submitted to the censors previous to their publication. This regulation was only allowed to pass as a purely temporary measure. Another part of the law, however, was enacted permanently to regulate the profession of printer and bookseller, and confirming and rendering more stringent the provisions of the decree of the 5th of February, 1810. Booksellers and printers were not to be allowed to practise their respective trades without a *brevet* or licence, which could be taken from them after a condemnation for any infringement against the rules laid for them, a rule which has been preserved, and has remained in the hands of the government a powerful weapon to keep the press in check.

Napoleon likewise returned from the island of Elba, with liberal promises. An era of liberty was to date from his return. A new constitution (the *Acte Additionnel*) was published, by which the press was once again declared free, the censure abolished, and the jury established for all offences of the pen. But Waterloo interfered just in time to prevent the acts of the Emperor from belying his words.

Again Louis XVIII. appeared upon the scene; still with liberal professions and promises which there is every reason to believe were sincere, the monarch being too judicious not to be aware that, however little at heart he might be enamoured of liberty, he must make with her a *mariage de raison*. He was overpowered, however, by the *émigrés* and the Catholic party, under whose influence the reign of the Bourbons was an almost continual effort to put down the press, by the submitting all writings to authorization, and an examination by the censors previous to their publication, and to prosecution, without the protection of trial by jury, for any offences that might be discovered in any publications that the censors might have allowed to pass. In 1819 a passing ray of liberty shone on France. The Chancellor de Serres brought in and the Chambers voted a law by which the censure was abolished, every one who could deposit a certain sum as caution money, was allowed to publish a paper, the printer was freed from all responsibility for the mere act of printing any offending paper, where no criminal participation in the offence was proved, and all offences committed by the press, except libels against private individuals were to be tried by a jury. But those brighter days were to be short. The murder of the Duke de Berri put them to an end. That crime, which was confessed by Louvel, the murderer himself, to have been resolved by him, more than a year before the law of 1819, under the sting of an insult received from the Duke, was of course attributed by the Royalists to the baneful influences of the press and the unbridled liberty given to it by that law. A new law was immediately made, bearing the stamp of the ideas which had brought it forth, and for a time re-establishing the censure. In 1822 was enacted the celebrated law "of tendency," under which the opposition papers were every day scrutinized by certain *employés* of an office known as "the

cabinet noir," all passages hostile to the Government or the dominant religion noted, and however insufficient in themselves to constitute a legal offence, were carefully registered in an account opened against each paper, and when a sufficient number had been obtained the sum total was brought forward in the shape of a prosecution for a tendency (*tendance*) to destroy the respect due to the Government or the religion of the State, a new offence invented by the law of 1822. Thus did things go on till the year 1830, when Charles X. climaxed a series of measures of oppression by the celebrated Ordinances of the 26th of July, which suspended the liberty of the press, dissolved the Chamber of Deputies, and reformed the electoral laws. On the 28th the Revolution had begun, and the reign of the Bourbons was no more.

Once more the liberty of the press was proclaimed in the charter published by Louis Philippe. The censure was abolished, and a declaration was made that it should never be established again, and an era of liberty began for France under a monarch whose merits, liberality, and talents subsequent events taught the nation to appreciate better than they had done during his reign. Discontent was caused by the "laws of September," which increased the amount of caution money required of founders of newspapers, and gave to the Court of Peers the trial of certain offences of a treasonable character against the sovereign's person and his Government. But Louis Philippe's promises were kept; the censure was not re-established, and the judgments of all offences of the press, save those consigned to the Chamber of Peers, were left to the jury.

THE REGISTRATION APPEALS.

No. II.

We continue our notice of these appeals with the cases relating to notices of objection. Amongst the first of these was a case involving the question whether a notice to the overseers of an objection to the name of a person on one of the lists of county voters must, now that there is a new separate list of £12 occupiers, specify on which of the lists the name is to be found. The supposed necessity for this was based upon an analogy to the notice to overseers in boroughs, where, by a note appended to the form given by the schedule to the statute, it is apparently required that in the case of there being more than one list for the borough, the list to which the notice refers shall be specified. Many of the revising barristers had produced before them an opinion of Sir Roundell Palmer to the effect that this ought to be done, or at all events were told that he had so advised. We are not, however, quite sure that his opinion went the length of saying that notices not specifying the list would be bad. It is more probable that he merely recommended its being done both for convenience and safety. It appeared, however, that this opinion had rather a curious effect in one county, for the revising barrister had at first acted in deference to it, and had stated three cases as to whether his decision in accordance with the opinion was right. Afterwards he made up his mind that the opinion either was wrong or did not go the length contended for, and then decided contrary to his own former decision, and stated three cases for the opinion of the Court as to the second decision. There was, however, we believe, a little difference between these cases, as some of them were stated with reference to the necessity of specifying the list in the notice sent to the person objected to as well as to the overseers. So far as the enactments in the subject were concerned there was still less reason for requiring this in the notice to the party, as there is no note to that effect even in the form given for boroughs, but perhaps there are more reasons based on convenience, for it is extremely common in counties for the name of a person to appear on two lists, and then it is certainly desirable that the objector should specify in his notice to the party to which list his objection refers. The Court held in all these cases that in counties it was not necessary to specify the list, on the ground that the

forms were entirely distinct in counties and in boroughs, and, notwithstanding some expressions in the Acts applying some of the borough regulations to the county list of £12 voters, it had not been intended to apply the rules as to notices of objections. This decision doubtless places the matter on the most intelligible, and, therefore, satisfactory basis, but we believe that some of the reasons given by the judges in their judgments will not bear a careful examination.

The Court next took a case from the borough of Horsham, in which the question was raised whether even in boroughs it was always necessary to specify the list, and whether the note before mentioned to the form in the schedule of the Act was not merely directory, so that a compliance with it was not absolutely essential to the validity of the notice. In this case it appeared very clearly that there could be no possibility of any one being misled by the omission to specify the list, because in one of the lists, that of persons entitled in respect of ancient right reserved to them in 1852, there happened only to be one name, and that was the very person who signed the notices to the other persons. In this case the Court took time to consider their judgment, and after considering it for some days, decided it upon the special circumstances of the case, holding that as there could be no possibility of a mistake, the notice might be held good; but they especially desired not to be taken as establishing a precedent to the effect that the lists need not be specified. As the election at Horsham has ended in a tie, this case, though of no value as a legal precedent, is likely to be of considerable practical importance.

Next came a case in which the question arose whether a notice of objection to a person on the £12 list must specify the grounds of objection as required by the 28 Vict. c. 36, s. 6. We have several times called attention to this question, both before and after the passing of the Registration Act, 1868; and it certainly appears, from the number of cases stated in which it had arisen, that we had not underrated the importance of the omission from all the Acts of any distinct enactment as to these notices. The question to be determined was one very much of discretion for the Court, for no form of objection at all was provided except by the general section incorporating all the previous law as to registration, "so far as applicable." The Court had, by their decision in the previous case, disposed of the question whether the borough form was the most applicable, and they had therefore to choose between holding a general notice according to section 7 of 6 Vict. c. 18, to be good, in which case undoubtedly they would not be giving full effect to the language of section 6 of 28 Vict. c. 36, or holding a notice specifying the grounds of objection to be good, in which case they might disregard several things in the form given, and declared to be a sufficient one, which would be inapplicable and likely to mislead.

The considerations *pro* and *con*. upon which the argument turned will be found fully referred to in our number of 12th September last (12 S. J. 919). The Court eventually held the latter view that the grounds must be specified, but although they were affirming the decision of the barrister, they declined to give costs against the appellant on the ground of the difficulty and importance of the point. Some members of the Court intimated that it would be proper for an objector to adapt to the requirements of the case the form given by the statute by altering the word register where it occurs in the form to list of voters. It was not, however, decided that it was necessary to do this, and, as the statute especially enacts that the form in question shall be sufficient in cases where it is necessary to give the grounds, it is probable the Court would not have gone that length. This latter point was raised before at least one revising barrister, and on his deciding that the form given by the schedule to the statute was sufficient, a case was asked for and granted, but eventually the appellant declined to proceed with it, so that this

point remains for this year undecided. If no new statute is passed, it is to be hoped that objectors will adopt the suggestion of the Court and adapt the form accordingly. The decision of the Court is certainly satisfactory in this respect, that next year great confusion would have been introduced by a contrary decision, which will now be avoided, while for this year there would probably be as many cases decided erroneously as far as the merits were concerned by a decision one way as the other upon the technical point.

This decision disposed of a considerable number of appeals. In one of the cases, however, which was stated with reference to a notice of objection, and which so far as that point was concerned was governed by previous cases, another point was also stated by the barrister and was argued. The voter appeared on the register as qualified in respect of a "leasehold house and garden." The objector contended that the voter had a freehold interest. He held under a lease *habendum* to him his executors, &c., for the term of his life, and if he should die within sixty years, then for so many years as should make up sixty on the whole. It was clear that this was a freehold, it was, however, contended, on the authority of Coke, that the tenant had also a present chattel interest vested in him. The Court did not seem inclined to take this view, but they decided in favour of the voter on the ground that whatever the real nature of the interest, as it was conferred by an instrument called a lease, it was not insufficient to describe it as leasehold. This case is an illustration of what we remarked upon a short time ago, viz., the liberal views now held by the Court of the barrister's power of amendment, and of recognising as practically sufficient descriptions of qualifications in some respect open to objection. From the tenor of the cases decided twenty or thirty years ago, we cannot much doubt that the Court would then have held either that "leasehold" was a description of a chattel interest, or if not, that it being left doubtful whether it referred to a freehold or a chattel qualification, it was an insufficient description. This decision, therefore, although the facts were so peculiar as to be unlikely to occur again, merits some attention on account of the principles laid down by the Court in deciding it. In the next case the Court also declined to give effect to an objection founded on a want of proper description, holding that a barrister was wrong in deciding an address of an objector given in a notice to be insufficient, and bad on the face of it, but that he must at all events take evidence as to the locality, and then decide the question of sufficiency according to the facts proved.

The Court then came to the cases stated upon questions of rating, and the first case (*Jones v. Bubb*) involving an apparently simple, though important, point, occupied the Court for a whole day. The question related to the right of a person to be on the register as a householder from 31st of July, 1867, to 31st July, 1868, in the borough of Malmesbury, and it was contended by the appellant that it was a fatal objection (the voter being in other respects qualified), that his name did not appear in a rate which was "made" in one sense, that is being made out, was signed by the overseers on the 18th of July, 1867, but which was not allowed by two justices, so as to become a valid and binding rate, until after the 31st of July. On the one side it was contended that when the statute required that the voter should, "during the time of such occupation (i.e., from 31st July in one year to the same day in the next) be rated to all rates, if any, made for the relief of the poor," they must have intended rate validly and effectually made, so that the date of the making in the sense meant was the date of allowance. On the other hand it was contended that the making intended was the making in the ordinary and popular sense, and that although it was essential that the rate should be allowed by justices, yet the allowance related back to the making, so that the date of the rate was the date when it was signed by the overseers. Many authorities,

more or less bearing upon the point, were quoted, and the Court eventually solved the difficulty by holding, without deciding what was to be considered the date of the rate, that the Legislature intended to require only rating to rates completely made within the year of occupation—that is, rates the making of which is both begun by the signing by the overseers, and also completed by allowance, within the year. This decision is no doubt so far a satisfactory one that it gives a definite rule, which in most cases will work well, and it is also no doubt in furtherance of the franchise. In some places, however, where the rates are made at long intervals, and considerable time is allowed to elapse between the making and allowance, it is quite possible that the rule may dispense almost entirely, or even occasionally entirely, with the necessity for the voter being rated at all. It has also effectually disposed of a notion which it appears from the remarks of the reporter to the *Times* has been entertained by some revising barristers, that it can ever be necessary for a claimant of the franchise to have been rated on any rates other than those made during the year of occupation. This notion, which appears to us, as we presume from its not being alluded to during the argument it also appeared to the Court and to the able counsel engaged in the case, quite contrary to the express words of the Act, was apparently founded on a mistaken view of the nature of a rate, and a misconception of the real effect of a case of *Bushell v. Luchett*, 1 Lut. 398. A rate is of course made by the parish officers upon an estimate of what they are likely to want for a certain period, but in no other sense is it made for any particular period. It is not a payment in any sense like interest, which, although only payable at stated intervals, accrues due *de die in diem*; neither is it even like rent, which, although by the strict rule of the common law accruing due only at stated intervals, yet is paid as consideration for the enjoyment of the subject-matter for a certain period, and is by statute apportionable in almost every case in which the question could arise, just as if it accrued due *de die in diem*. A rate, however, is not, as a general rule, apportionable between two successive occupiers. The statute 17 Geo. 11, c. 38, s. 12, provides for a species of apportionment in certain cases—viz., where one occupier succeeds another in premises in respect of which rates are due, in which case the succeeding occupier can be made liable to pay a proportion of the rate, as also where a person enters into premises which were unoccupied, and consequently not rated in the preceding rate. There is, however, no provision in that Act for entering the name of the new occupier on the rate, and even where it has been done it has been decided (see *Reg v. Eddowes*, 7 W. R. 63) that this does not amount to a rating of the person whose name is so inserted. Neither would the nonpayment of the proportion of rate to which an occupier might so be made liable disqualify him from obtaining the franchise unless it had been properly demanded of him (see *Flatcher v. Boodle*, 13 W. R. 340, 34 L. J. O. P. 77). In the case of *Bushell v. Luchett*, 2 C. B. 111, 1 Lutw. 398, it is undoubtedly said by the judges that there must always be a rate for the time being, but there, as in all other cases, it is unsafe to take a single expression of the judges and apply it generally and without reference to the subject under discussion. The subject was the validity of a claim under the 30th section of the Reform Act of 1832 to be rated, and a reference to the case will show that all that was decided was, that in a place where poor-rates had ever been levied, there was always one rate (that is, the last valid one) so far in being as to enable a person, by virtue of the statute, to place himself in a position in which he was to be "deemed to have been rated." That, of course, is a very different thing from saying that there is always a rate in being to which a person can be rated.

It follows, therefore, from these considerations that even if the Legislature had said simply that a person in order to acquire the franchise should be "rated for

twelve months," the construction to be put upon the enactment would be, "rated to all rates made during the twelve months."

As it is, however, the case has really been expressly provided for. In the Act of 1832 the provision is express, "rated to all rates made during the time of such his occupation so required as aforesaid" (see section 27). In the Act of 1867 the words "during his occupation" have been transferred to the beginning of the sentence, which runs thus, "has during the time of such occupation been rated to all rates made for the relief of the poor in respect of such premises." It is plain that this means "then made," especially when it is remembered that the two Acts are to be construed together. On the whole, therefore, it appears that this point referred to by the *Times* reporter is perfectly plain, and that the only point really worth discussing in *Jones v. Budd* was that actually discussed—viz., what rates could be said to be rates made within the year.

We cannot but think that the *Times* reporter was libelling the revising barristers as a class when he stated, probably from his knowledge of one or more particular instances, that it had generally been held by them that rating to the last rate prior to the 31st July was required. The prominence given to the reporter's remarks by the leading article in the *Times* the next day, and in the *Daily News* on the 17th has induced us to refer to the case of *Jones v. Budd*, and the result supposed to follow from it, at greater length than the real importance of the point decided might otherwise seem to warrant.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

EVIDENCE TAKEN IN OTHER SUITS.

Allen v. Bennett, M.R., 16 W. R. 1075.

This case settles a point of practice relating to evidence which has been involved in some obscurity owing to the wording of one of the Consolidated Orders. In the order as to evidence it is provided that, while decrees made in other courts may be read without any order for the purpose, evidence taken in other courts cannot be read without an order (see *Morgan's Chancery Acts and Orders*, 4th ed. p. 466). Applications have frequently been made to the Court, and in some cases granted, for such orders, but in the case of *Allen v. Bennett* the Master of the Rolls, overruling his own contrary decision in *Lake v. Peisley*, L. R. 1 Eq. 173, decided that, notwithstanding the express words of the General Order, it is neither proper nor necessary to obtain an order to read evidence or depositions taken in another court. In *Allen v. Bennett* the plaintiff desired to be allowed to read in a Chancery suit depositions which had been taken in the Court of Bankruptcy, relating to the matters in question in the Chancery suit, and on application being made to the Master of the Rolls, he gave leave to read the depositions, saving all just exceptions; but he afterwards directed his order to be cancelled, on the authority principally of *Williams v. Broadhead*, 1 Sim. 151, and *Stephenson v. Biney*, 14 W. R. 788, L. R. 2 Eq. 303. The principle of these cases seems to be this. If evidence has been taken in another suit, but in the Court of Chancery, then an order may be obtained to read it, for the Court will take notice of its own record; but if evidence has been taken in another court proper office copies of such evidence must be produced in the Chancery suit, and an order to read such evidence is of no value if such office copies are not produced, and is mere surplusage if they are. Thus in *Stephenson v. Biney* (*ubi sup.*) Wood, V.C., said:—"The rule by which the Court of Chancery used to be stated by Mr. Daniell: 'Depositions taken in the Court of Exchequer with regard to suits in the Exchequer is thus chequer may be read as evidence in chancery in a cause relating to the same matter and between the same parties or their privies. It is, however, to be remarked

that the depositions must be introduced as evidence in the ordinary course, and that an order of the Court, directing the depositions in the Exchequer to be read at the hearing in chancery, will not be necessary or proper; the reason being that this Court does not know what the record of the Court of Exchequer is; and in *Williams v. Broadhead* (*ubi sup.*) the Vice-Chancellor said, in refusing a similar order to that which was asked for in *Lake v. Peasley*, "Where there is cause and cross-cause, there the order which has been obtained here is extremely useful; because it saves the necessity of examining the witnesses in both causes, and the depositions are read, without more, as if taken in both causes. But here, not the depositions themselves, which the Court of Exchequer will not part with, but office copies of the depositions, are to be read, if at all, upon the principle that they are, in their nature, legal evidence, having regard to the subject of the two suits; and the plaintiff is entitled to read them as evidence without any order, upon production of the office copy of the bill and answer, for the purpose of showing that the same points were in issue in the first cause. The order which has been obtained will not relieve the plaintiff from the necessity of the production of the office copies of the bill and answer and depositions, and, serving no purpose whatever, the order must be discharged, as improperly introduced upon the records of the Court."

On the whole, then, it appears that the difficulty has arisen from the words of the order, and that if it had said that depositions taken in any chancery cause may by order be used as evidence in another cause, it would have correctly represented the practice—viz., that where there is a cause and cross-cause in the same court, the evidence taken in one suit may, by order of course, be read in the other, because, as Sir John Leach observed in *Williams v. Broadhead*, it saves the necessity of examining witnesses in both causes; but, by using the word *order* instead of *cause*, the framers of the Consolidated Orders have given rise to the misapprehension that it is necessary to apply for leave to read that which must be, if at all, made evidence altogether independently of such leave.

Finally, it may be well to notice the conditions upon which evidence taken in one cause is admissible as evidence in another.

I. Both causes must relate to the same matter and be between the same parties or their privies (see *Asken v. Poulterers Company*, 2 Ves. Sen. 89, where co-defendants in one cause were plaintiff and defendant in the other, and were allowed to use the depositions put in in the former cause. *Lawrence v. Maule*, 4 Drew. 472; *Hope v. Liddell*, 21 Beav. 480; and *Humphreys v. Pen-sam*, 1 M. & Cr. 580, are instructive cases on this point.

II. The evidence must have been regularly put in in the former cause so as to be open to cross-examination (see *Moore v. Harper*, 14 W. R. 306, and it appears, though there is some conflict of practice on this point, that if the witness is still alive, and can be produced, he will, if necessary, be ordered to be produced: *Williams v. Williams*, 12 W. R. 633; *Carrington v. Carnock*, 2 Sim. 567.

MAINTENANCE OUT OF THE CORPUS OF A CONTINGENT FUND.

Re Rosa Robinson, an infant, V.C.M., 16 W. R. 1106.

We think that this is the only reported case in which the Court has directed a portion of a fund in which an infant was contingently interested to be raised for his or her maintenance, on the application of the infant and her parents, notwithstanding the restraint of anticipation imposed on the person then entitled to the enjoyment of the fund. The circumstances of the case were these. A lady was entitled during her life for her separate use, with a claim against anticipation, to a fund of £2,000 stock, or thereabouts. Subject to her life interest, her only child was entitled to the fund contingently on

her attaining twenty-one. Her only child, a young lady of nineteen, owing to events which had rendered her parents unable to support her and complete her education, came to the court with her parents as co-petitioners to ask for assistance. The petition prayed that a sum of £220 might be raised and paid to her guardian, and that the sum so raised might be deemed an advancement *pro tanto* in respect of the young lady's contingent interest in the fund. The reader will observe that the main objection would be, that in the event of her dying under age, the sum so raised would be lost to the parties to whom it was given over in the event of her parents dying without issue who should attain twenty-one; but this objection was met by a policy for £300 having been taken out on the chance of her dying under twenty-one, so that in the event of her death before that time the fund would be recouped with interest the sum to be raised for the purposes of the petition. The same course was pursued in *Re Arbuckle*, 14 W. R. 535, where a reference to chambers was directed, for the purpose of effecting a similar assurance. The petition asked that the £220 might be applied in payment of the premium on the assurance in question, and costs of the petition, and that the balance might be handed over to the guardian on the usual undertaking. Both parents were living, and there was a possibility of further issue of the marriage; but the sum sought to be raised was such as could not, under any conceivable circumstances, exceed the share to which the young lady would ultimately become entitled. The Vice-Chancellor, as the reader will have foreseen, thought the clause against anticipation a serious objection, but nevertheless made the order, under the peculiar circumstances of the case.

Maintenance in strictness should come out of income; but where the fund is so small that the income is inadequate for the purpose, the Court will break into the corpus: *Re Estate of Mary England*, 1 R. & M. 499, especially for educational purposes, education being the investment of a minor's capital, which brings in the highest returns in after life.

Maintenance was given out of contingent interests in *Cavendish v. Mercer*, 5 Ves. 195 n. There was a residuary bequest of a large fund to infants in equal shares, payable at twenty-one, with benefit of survivorship, and in case of the death of all under twenty-one, to their mother. The father had £1,800 a-year, but was not withal of ability to maintain the infants in a way suitable to their expectations. Lord Bathurst, C., gave them maintenance out of the fund. See, too, *Fendall v. Nash*, 14 p. 197. *Lambert v. Parker*, G. Coop. 143, was a similar case, where maintenance was allowed out of the income of a fund bequeathed to children as and when they should attain twenty-one, with benefit of survivorship.

Cases like *Ex parte Kibble*, 11 Ves. 604, are distinguishable. In this case a residuary fund was bequeathed to five infants on attaining twenty-one, with benefit of survivorship, and in case all should die under twenty-one, then to their sister, who was of full age. The Court declined to grant maintenance out of their contingent shares to the infants respectively. Lord Eldon, C., stated the reason to be that there was a gift over. The object of this gift would be a loser if maintenance were granted in the event of all dying under twenty-one. Had there been no gift over, maintenance would have been given, as all in that case had an equal chance of surviving, and there was no one person liable to contingent injury. In the present day we submit that this case would not be followed, as protection to the object of the gift over could be provided by the system of life assurance. This rule was explained by Kindersley, V.C., in *Re Arbuckle* (*ubi sup.*). The Court, his Honour said, can only direct maintenance in the case of an infant who is one of a class entitled contingently on their attaining twenty-one, with the consent of the persons entitled in remainder. He therefore declined to order maintenance out of a fund to which infants of another family (being

of course incompetent to assent) were entitled in remainder.

When the principle of granting maintenance out of the income of a contingent fund was admitted, to break into the fund itself for the same purpose soon followed. Thus, in *Ex parte Hayes*, 3 De G. & Sm. 485, a bonus on a policy settled on trusts, under which an infant was entitled contingently on attaining twenty-one, was raised for her maintenance. And many of the cases of this class are referred to in *Re Arbuckle* (*ubi sup.*). *Chambers v. Goldwin*, 11 Ves. 1, which was followed in *Martin v. Martin*, 14 W. R. 421, L. R. 1 Eq. 369, is an early instance of maintenance being given out of the income of a contingent fund. *Chambers v. Goldwin*, however, has always seemed to us a peculiar case. There was an allowance for the maintenance of the testator's son until twenty-one, and daughter until twenty-one or marriage, and on her attaining twenty-one she was to have £6,000, Was not the testator's meaning this? "If my daughter marries under twenty-one, she must marry a man who can support her, and to secure my object I declare that her allowance shall cease at her marrying under twenty-one." She did marry under twenty-one, and came to the Court for maintenance out of the £6,000, and maintenance was given to her, the Court thinking it expedient to fill up the chasm which the testator had thought it fit to leave between his daughter's marriage and majority. Cases like these must be dealt with on their respective merits. We do not suppose that *Re Rosa Robinson* will become a precedent: peculiar cases of hardship which induce the Court to encroach on a general principle ought not to be treated as precedents; it is, however, in our judgment, a case of interest, showing as it does the tendency of the Court to set aside technical rules when acting in its administrative capacity in order to do substantial justice, and as such we recommend this case to the notice of the reader.

COMMON LAW.

EVIDENCE—VERBAL STATEMENTS BY TESTATOR.

Johnson v. Lyford, Prob., 16 W. R. 1130.

As a general rule verbal or written statements are not admissible in evidence, except as admissions which may be used against the person making them. If it is desired to prove the facts contained in any statement or writing witnesses must be produced who can speak to the facts of their own knowledge. In some exceptional cases such statements are, however, evidence. In *Johnson v. Lyford* the plaintiff wished to prove that a certain writing was the copy of a will which had been destroyed. He was allowed to give evidence of statements made by the testator at the time when he was making the will which went far to prove that the writing in question was a copy of such will. This evidence was admitted, on the ground that "the verbal declarations or statements made by a testator in and about the making of his will, when accompanying acts done by him in relation to that subject, fall within a well-known principle of the general law of evidence, and have always been admitted, though not made on oath." This is no new rule of law, but as it is one of practical importance in the daily conduct of litigation, we notice this case as a new illustration of an old principle.

LAWYERS RETURNED TO THE NEW PARLIAMENT.

BARRISTERS.

Berwick-on-Tweed	J. Stapleton.
Bodmin	Hon. F. L. Gower.
Boston	T. Collins.
Bridgewater	J. C. W. Kinglake.
Bury St. Edmunds	Joseph A. Hardcastle.
Cambridge	W. Fowler.
" University	Right Hon. S. H. Walpole.
Carmarvon	W. B. Hughes.
Chatham	A. J. Otway.
Chelsea	C. W. Dilke.

Cheltenham	H. B. Samuelson.
Chester	H. C. Raikes.
Christchurch	E. H. Burke.
Coventry	A. S. Hill, Q.C.
Cricklade	Hon. F. Codrigan.
Denbigh	*Watkin Williams.
Devonport	*M. Chambers, Q.C.
"	*J. D. Lewis.
Dewsbury	*Serjeant Simon.
Dover	*G. Jessel, Q.C.
Dudley	H. B. Sheridan.
Durham city	*J. R. Davison, Q.C.
Exeter	*J. D. Coleridge, Q.C.
Finabury	*J. McCullagh Torrens.
Frome	*Thomas Hughes.
Gloucester	C. J. Monk.
Halifax	J. Stanfeld.
Hants, North	G. Slater-Booth.
Horsham	*R. H. Hurst.
Ipswich	H. E. Adair.
"	*Henry W. West, Q.C.
King's Lynn	Hon. R. Bourke.
Launceston	*Henry C. Lopes.
Leeds	W. St. J. Wheelhouse.
Leominster	R. Arkwright.
London University	Right Hon. R. Lowe.
Lincoln	*J. H. Palmer, Q.C.
Marylebone	*Thomas Chambers, Q.C.
Montgomery	Hon. C. D. R. H. Tracy.
Montgomeryshire	C. W. W. Wyn.
Morpeth	Sir G. Grey.
Newcastle-on-Tyne	Right Hon. T. E. Headlam, Q.C.
Northamptonshire, North	Right Hon. G. W. Hunt.
Oxford	Right Hon. E. Cardwell.
"	*W. V. Harcourt, Q.C.
" University	Right Hon. G. Hardy.
"	Right Hon. J. R. Mowbray.
Peterborough	G. H. Whalley.
Petersfield	W. Nicholson.
Plymouth	*Sir R. P. Collier, Q.C.
Reading	*Sir F. H. Goldmid, Bart., Q.C.
"	Shaw-Lefevre.
Richmond	*Sir R. Palmer, Q.C.
Rochester	*Serjeant Kinglake.
Salford	*W. T. Charley.
Sandwich	T. Brassay, jun.
Scarborough	J. D. Dent.
Shoreham	Right Hon. S. Cave.
Southampton	Right Hon. R. Gurney, Q.C.
Southwark	*John Locke, Q.C.
Stroud	*H. S. P. Winterbotham.
"	S. S. Dickinson.
Sussex, East	J. G. Dodson.
Taunton	*Serjeant Cox.
Tiverton	Hon. G. Denman, Q.C.
Tower Hamlets	*A. S. Ayrton.
Tynemouth	*E. T. Smith.
Worcester city	W. E. Laslett.
York	J. Lowther.

IRELAND.

Cork City	J. F. Maguire.
Kildare	Right Hon. P. O. Cogan.
Kilkenny	Sir J. Gray.
Limerick County	E. J. Synan.
Mallow	*Serjeant Sullivan.

SOLICITORS.

Chippenham	G. Goldney.
Newark	G. Hodgkinson.
Stockton	Joseph Dodds.

The practising barristers are distinguished by an asterisk.

REVIEW.

The Law of Life Assurance. By CHARLES JOHN BUNTON, M.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. London: Laytons. 1868.

The first edition of Mr. Bunton's work is well known as a complete and useful compendium of the law and practice of life assurance; and the present re-issue of the book has been carefully edited, and fully sustains the character of the first. Much matter now obsolete, and therefore superfluous, has been judiciously expunged, and new statutes and recent decisions have been incorporated. A book upon such a subject as this does not, from its very nature, admit of any strictly scientific mode of treatment or distribution of the subject. All that can be done is to bring together all the law and the usages, the knowledge of which is likely to be of use to the various classes of

persons who have to do with life assurance, and to make this all as easily accessible as possible by means of arrangement of the matter and a good index. This seems to have been the plan upon which Mr. Bunyon worked, and he has adopted it with success. His book therefore deals with many subjects, such, for example, as the formation and winding-up of companies, and guarantee policies, which a lawyer would never look for under the head of life assurance. This we do not regard as a fault. From Mr. Bunyon's point of view it is the contrary.

One of the most valuable points about Mr. Bunyon's book is the fulness with which he treats of the usages as distinguished from the positive law relating to insurance. Thus all the forms of proceeding in use at the various offices in the formation of the contract, the forms of declaration required, and so on, are fully described. The same is true of the various clauses of exemption from liability now in use. In a matter such as life assurance, in which the application of the law to each individual case depends so much upon the usual course of business, such knowledge as Mr. Bunyon conveys is specially valuable.

This book begins with an "Introductory Chapter on the Amendment of the Law." This introduction appears to us not very happily conceived. It is an introduction wholly unintelligible to any one not already familiar with the subject. It gives not a history of the law on the subject generally, but of the changes made since the last edition was published. And it proceeds to suggest changes in the law not always very judicious.

Thus, with respect to the property of married women, which is one of the subjects treated of in this very comprehensive introduction, in order to prevent husbands from making away with the capital of their wife's property, Mr. Bunyon recommends that "the rule which requires the concurrence of the wife after a separate examination and explanation of the consequences of her act for the alienation of real estate, should be applied to all property without distinction, personal as well as real." And he thinks the plan would work "with the greatest ease and simplicity." Suppose, for instance, that the stock in trade of a stationer's shop belonged to a woman, and that she married, how conveniently Mr. Bunyon's plan would work when a quire of note-paper had to be sold! Some other of Mr. Bunyon's suggestions are of the same class as this, and seem to show that he is not so happy in devising new law as in stating and applying old.

COURTS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

STATEMENT OF THE NUMBER OF CAUSES, PETITIONS, &c., disposed of in Court in the fortnight ending Thursday, November 19, 1868.

L. C.		L. J.		M. R.		V. C. S.		V. C. M.		V. C. G.	
A.P.	A.P.M.	A.P.	A.P.M.	C.	P.	C.	P.	C.	P.	C.	P.
0	0	3	6	12	20	19	9	12	18	15	19

QUEEN'S BENCH.

(Before the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, and LUSH, HANNEN, and HAYES, JJ.)

*Re the Justices of Westbury.
Intimidation of Voters.*

Montagu Williams obtained a rule nisi for a mandamus to compel the justices of Westbury to hear a summons under 17 & 18 Vict. c. 102, against a manufacturer of the town, for alleged intimidation. The allegation was that this gentleman, on the 31st ult., inflicted loss of work and practised intimidation on a certain voter in his employ; that the master sent for the workman, and, learning in reply to a question, for which candidate he intended voting, said that no one who voted so should work for him, and in the end refused the voter any more work. The magistrates had dismissed the summons, saying:—"We have considered this case, and our decision is that we do not consider it was the intention of the Legislature that cases of this kind should be brought before a bench of magistrates; therefore, we prefer leaving it open

to the parties to proceed with the case in the Queen's Bench or by indictment."

COMMON PLEAS.

Nov. 14.—KIRKING, J., announced that the Rules for the guidance of the judges trying election inquiries under the Act of last session having to be settled, Willes, J., would not sit in the Court of Common Pleas this term, nor in all probability would he do so next term.

COUNTY COURTS.

LAMBETH.

(Before J. PITT TAYLOR, Esq., Judge.)

Nov. 17.—*Dennis v. Stelling.*

Where liability for medicine and attendance upon a wife does not extend to the husband—Principal and Agent.

The plaintiff, a surgeon, claimed £1 for several attendances upon defendant's wife. It appeared that plaintiff's assistant was first called in, but plaintiff attended subsequently.

The defendant denied the claim, and said he had reason to suspect his wife's fidelity, and having obtained proof that his suspicion was well founded he charged her with her misconduct in the presence of her father. She immediately went into a state of frantic excitement, possibly hysteria, and the father proposed to send for a doctor. Defendant said there was no necessity for that, as she was only shamming, as he knew by experience. The father, however, sent to plaintiff's surgery, and plaintiff's assistant attended. Defendant told the assistant that he (the defendant) had nothing to do with the matter, and would not be responsible. He had since obtained a divorce.

The plaintiff here said he attended after the assistant, and had never been told by the defendant that he did not consider himself liable. The patient being the defendant's wife, and being attended in his own house, there was no apparent reason for supposing that the husband was not liable in the ordinary way.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR said it was not likely that the defendant under the circumstances would send for a doctor to his wife, and the repudiation of the liability to the assistant would extend to the principal. It was not necessary to repeat the repudiation to the principal. The judgment must be for the defendant.

APPOINTMENT.

Mr. CHARLES FEW, of Henrietta-street, Covent-garden, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the acknowledgments of deeds by married women, in and for the city of London, also in and for the counties of Middlesex and Surrey, and the city and liberties of Westminster.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

REGISTRATION OF JUDGMENTS.

Sir,—It is indeed high time that the offices for the registration of judgments were "disestablished," as suggested by your able correspondent of last week, or that at least something else was done to remove the very anomalous state of things which now exists. As a "case in point," confirmatory of Mr. Charles F. Taggart's letter, I trouble you with one of my recent experiences. I have the misfortune to be concerned, at the present moment, as solicitor for a trustee, the intended mortgagee, and an intended mortgagor of a freehold estate. I was advised by an eminent counsel, on behalf of the trustee, to make the "usual" searches for incumbrances. In deference to this advice I of course caused the Common Pleas registry of judgments to be searched before completing, and as a judgment against the intended borrower was found registered, I deemed it prudent not to complete until it were removed; but, mark, Sir, my "peculiarly perplexing predicament" in consequence. I am advised by counsel that I dare not allow the trustee to advance the money, and on the other hand the intending mortgagor is threatening proceedings for not completing. I need scarcely say that the registered judgment has not been followed up by the execution, &c., prescribed by the "ill-constructed" Acts of Parliament, and although I took the precaution to obtain the usual memorandum from the intended mortgagor to pay the costs if the business went

off by reason of any defect in his title, I cannot quite see how I am to obtain them from him, notwithstanding the apparent twofold advantage I possess of being "on both sides."

I agree with your correspondent that in this age of "reform" the sheriff should be empowered to seize and sell freeholds under the writ of *fiat facias*; the office for registration of judgments would then, I venture to think, soon (in practice, at all events) be a thing of the past.

10, Bedford-row, Nov. 18.

GEO. BESWICK.

COMPUTATION OF TIME TO PLEAD.

SIR,—Could any of your readers inform me the solution to this seemingly simple, but really technical question? An order for further time to plead is made, and the last day for delivering plea is Saturday, but as all pleadings are to be delivered by two o'clock on that day could the plaintiff sign judgment on default of reserving plea by that time. The order of course meant full days, but how would the fact of the two o'clock service affect them, or rather the last day?

Nov. 19.

LEGIS.

[The defendant may plead at any time before eleven o'clock on Monday morning, when the judgment office opens. See *Connelly v. Bremner*, 14 W. R. 781.—Ed. S. J.]

FOREIGN TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

AMERICA.

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT, MASSACHUSETTS.

Minot v. Paine.

Stock dividends capital, not income.

A trustee under a will held stock in a railroad in trust to pay the income to A., remainder to B.; and the question was whether new shares, issued by the road to represent accumulated profits expended in permanent improvements, were capital of the trust fund.

The Court, CHAPMAN, C.J., made an extensive review of authorities, and came to the conclusion that the new shares should be held as capital for the legatee in remainder, their income to be paid to the legatee for life.

The Court do not regard the fact that the dividends were made from net earnings of the roads as material. The net earnings of a railroad corporation remain the property of the company as fully as its other property, till the directors declare a dividend. A shareholder has no title to them prior to the dividend being declared. In most of our prosperous railroad corporations the directors apply a considerable portion of their net income to the laying of additional tracks, the building of new depots, the increase of their rolling stock, and sometimes to the purchase of land which they deem important to the accommodation of their business, or other permanent improvements of the road; and they have discretionary power to do so. It is true that they may abuse their power, and refuse to make any dividends, though their net income may be large, and apply their funds to the permanent improvement of the road, and thereby deprive a life tenant of all benefit from the shares, and reserve the whole income for the benefit of the remainderman. But in the present case it is not alleged that there has been an abuse of power; and it need not be decided whether, in case of such abuse, the trustee could protect the interests of the tenants for life in any other way than by selling the shares and investing the trust fund in some other way by which he may obtain a reasonable income.

It is obvious that if the directors had made no stock dividend, but had invested the income in permanent improvements, making no increase of the number of shares, the improvements would have been capital, belonging to the legatees in remainder. So if they had thus invested it, and, instead of increasing the number of shares, had increased their par value, the shares would have been mere capital, and not income as to the shareholder, though increased in value by the application of the net income of the road to that purpose. So when they increase the number of shares, each share of all the stock in the corporation is in its nature capital. The new shares take their place among the old ones, and each of the old shares thereby becomes a less proportion of the whole stock than it was before, and is entitled to a less proportion of dividends declared than it was before. It may be that dividends are less per cent.

than they would otherwise have been, and in such case the old stock is diminished in value, and the interest of the remainderman is injuriously affected. But, on the other hand, the effect may be by increasing the business of the road to increase the dividends and the market value of the old stock. But neither courts nor trustees can investigate such matters with accuracy, and in many cases no investigation can be made. A trustee needs some plain principle to guide him; and the *cestus que trust* ought not to be subjected to the expense of going behind the action of the directors and investigating the concerns of the corporations, especially if it is out of our jurisdiction. A simple rule is to regard cash dividends, however large, as income; and stock dividends, however made, as capital. The Court are of opinion that this rule is more in conformity with the legal and equitable rights of shareholders than any other that has been suggested. It is also in conformity with the decisions of the Court, so far as the subject has been considered.—*New York Daily Transcript.*

SUPREME COURT.

Right of Landlord to maintain Possession.—Where the landlord and owner of premises in fee, claiming that the term has expired, enters without process and without force, during the temporary absence of the tenant, the latter has no right to take the law into his own hands and attempt to dislodge the former by force. The landlord being in the actual possession, has a right to maintain it, and to use force, if necessary, for that purpose.—*Sage v. Harpending.*—(To appear in 49 Barbour).—*New York Daily Transcript.*

SUPREME COURT, VERMONT.

Parent and Child—Contract—Implied Promise.—The rule, that where a child, after becoming of age, remains in a parent's service the law will imply no promise, on the part of the parent, to pay for the labour, but an express promise must be proved, applies also to adopted children. The plaintiff was an adopted daughter of the defendant. After it was understood she was of age, the defendant agreed to pay her for her labour. Subsequent to this agreement she and her foster parents learned that they had been mistaken one year in her age, that she, in fact, arrived at her majority one year earlier than she had supposed, and consequently had been in the defendant's service for one year after she became of age without pay, and without any agreement or expectation of pay. Held, that the law would imply no promise or contract to pay her for that year. *Lunay v. Vantyne*, 40 Vt. Rep.

Slander.—The defendant, having lost goods by theft, went to the plaintiff's house with a police officer, and, in answer to questions as to the object of his visit, accused plaintiff of the theft, and stated the grounds of his belief. In an action of slander, held, that this was a privileged communication, if made *bona fide*, unless express malice were found by the jury. Nor is the privilege defeated by the fact that the charges were made in the presence of third parties and in an intemperate manner. The question of privilege is a question of law.—*Brow v. Hathaway*, 13 Allen (Massachusetts Rep.).

Stock.—A holder of the guaranteed capital stock of a corporation is not a creditor of the corporation in such a sense as to be entitled to an action at law for the stipulated dividends.—*Williston v. Mich. S. & N. Ind. R. R. Co.*—*ib.*

NEW JERSEY.

Promissory Notes.—Payment by the maker of interest on a note which is void, because made on Sunday, does not in itself amount to a new promise to pay the money due.—*Reeves v. Butcher* (30 N. J. Rep.).—*New York Daily Transcript.*

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of the Law Students' Debating Society on Tuesday evening last, Mr. Warrington in the chair, the question for discussion was, "Is it advisable that the bill introduced into Parliament in the last session with reference to the property of married women should become law." The debate was opened by Mr. Turner in the negative, and so decided by the society. The number of members present was thirty-two.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

CANDIDATES WHO PASSED THE FINAL EXAMINATION.

Michaelmas Term, 1868.

Names of Candidates.	To whom Articled, Assigned, &c.	Name of Candidate.	To whom Articled, Assigned, &c.
Aldridge, Alfred Frank	Charles Cydwelyn Ellis.	Plunkett, Edward	William Alfred Plunkett.
Allinson, John James	Edward Milligen Beloe.	Poole, Edmund	Charles Champion.
Andrews, George, jun.	George Andrews.	Priee, John Edwards	William Price.
Ashbridge, John	Samuel Prentice.	Prichard, Walter Stennett...	Henry Prichard.
Aeling, Edward	Ashley Maples.	Rhys, Morgan	Richard White Boor.
Baines, Henry	Alfred Beaven.	Roberts, John	Edward Griffith Powell.
Barnard, John Charles	John Barnard.	Robinson, Tom	John Robinson.
Beaumont, Harry	Hugh Robert Evans.	Ruddle, William Ezra	George Bell Rothera; James G. Etches.
Beck, John, jun.	Thomas J. Badger; James Roberts.	Shorto, Charles Coard, B.A.	John Edward Gray Hill.
Bonifant, Robert Henry	Nathaniel Creswick; George Henry Blackwell.	Simpson, Edwd George	Joseph Dodds.
Bowerman, Richard John ...	Richard Bowerman; John B. Nunn.	Simpson, George Joseph ...	Richard Helps; Arthur S. Helps.
Bray, Wm. Harvey Wentworth.....	Beer & Rundle.	Strong, Robert Dundas, B.A.	Charles Underwood.
Broughall, John William ...	John Broughall.	Sudbury, John Jackson	William E. Chapman.
Browne, Thomas	John Rogers Browne.	Tahourdin, Rene James	Charles Tahourdin.
Buchanan, William Gold ...	Thomas Gold Edwards; Richard Pennington.	Tapley, Richard	Richard R. Millar Daw.
Burrows, Frederic Abernethy.....	Robert Brotherson Upton.	Thompson, Richard Phillips, B.A.	John Hunter.
Case, Charles Alfred	John Case.	Tilly, James, jun.	Thomas Johnson.
Chew, William Laurence ...	Thomas Heath Chew.	Trehane, John	Henry Ford, M.A.
Cleebury, John	Thomas Mortimer Cleebury.	Trompe, Benjamin Humphries	Joseph Leech.
Cockell, Edward Merrick ...	Francis William Arkcoll.	Venn, Alfred Edward.....	Mark Jameson.
Collins, James Duppa.....	James Bowker.	Vernede, Oscar	William Jennings.
Dewes, Henry Arthur.....	Henry Dewes; Charles C. Ellis.	Wade, Armigel	G. De Vins Wade; Charles S. Benning.
Ellman, Hugh Frederic	Frederic Ellman; Frederick William Yeates.	Whitehead, Spencer	Robert Harding Milward.
Elmalie, Graham	John Foster Elmalie.	Wilde, Spencer Croughton...	Francis Broderip; Alfred Markby.
Empson, Josiah Sadler	William Drake; James Saunders.	Wilkinson, Piercy	John Thomas Tweed.
Frere, George Edgar	Bartle John L. Frere.	Williams, Thomas Brooking, jun.	William Tolmie Tresidder.
Gibbs, Joseph	James Read, jun.	Williams, William, jun.	William Williams.
Grace, James	John Barnes Barrow.	Wood, Richard Bayliffe	Alfred John Keary; James Henry Street.
Greenfield, Basil Edmund ...	Edward Futvoye.		
Greenup, William	James Barratt; John F. Marsh.		
Groom, Edward Alfred	Alfred Groom.		
Hailstone, Arthur	Charles Richards Steward.		
Haines, Arthur Vernon, B.A.	Greenway Robins.		
Hallowes, William Alexander Tooke	William Hallowes.		
Hassall, James Wright	George N. S. Jones; Ebenezer Sargent; Edward Wright.		
Hendriks, Alfred.....	Joseph Francis Holmes; Frederick Moojen.		
Hick, Albert Edwin	Henry Turnbull.		
Hignett, Thomas Henry ...	John Hawley Edwards,		
Huntley, George Thomas ...	Charles Wilkin.		
Isaacs, Henry Moses	Charles Wintle.		
Jessett, Claude.....	William Gresham.		
Johnson, Robert Burton.....	Thomas Heydon.		
Jones, Frederick	Arthur Perry Bower.		
King, Austin Joseph	Francis Thornley King.		
Lees, William	Caleb Hilton; Robert Ashton.		
Lovell, Walter.....	Charles F. Lovell; Charles Henry Lovell.		
Lumley, Walter	Louis Charles Lumley.		
Marchant, Jonathan Augustine	George Allen.		
Marlow, Frederick James ...	John Champion Needham.		
Marsh, James	Henry Coppock.		
Mathews, Francis Claughton, B.A.	Charles Edward Mathews.		
Matthews, Peter Barron ...	Harry Shoubridge.		
Moss, John Seymour	William Henry Moss.		
Parker, George Francis	Benjamin Peverley; Francis Moon.		
Paul, Alfred John	Robert Lowe Grant Vassall.		
Pettingell, Joseph Edmund..	Joseph W. Pettingell; Frederick F. Ayre; William Noble.		
Pidcock, John Henzell, B.A.	Charles Pidcock.		
Plant, Alfred Rowland	Robert Baxter Lowndes.		

CALLS TO THE BAR.—Nov. 17.

INNER TEMPLE.—Rooke Pennington, B.A., LL.D., London (holder of a studentship awarded by the Council of Legal Education in Trinity Term, 1868, and of an Exhibition awarded in July, 1867); Alexander Campbell Onslow, B.A., Cambridge; Thomas Davis Mitchell, Oxford; Reginald More Bray, B.A. Cambridge; John Francis Bulley, B.A. Oxford; Francis Henry Jeune, B.A. Oxford; Edward Philip Monckton, B.A. Cambridge; James Craufurd, B.A. Dublin; Aviet Agabeg, Cambridge; Edward James Castle; John Francis Fortescue Horner, B.A. Oxford; Frederick Jacobus Kotze, Cambridge; Frederick Augustus Waite, Cambridge; Thomas Lambert Mears, B.A. London; Shuckburgh Norris Risley, Oxford; James Halkett; George Owen Swaffield, M.A. Cambridge; Dirk Jacob Van Ronen Van Breda, Oxford; Leonard John Graham-Clarke, M.A. Oxford; Thomas Threlfall, M.A. Cambridge; John Thomas Norreys Russell, B.A. Cambridge; Robert Alexander Kinglake, B.A. Cambridge; Thomas Townsend Bucknill; Edward Buchanan, Cambridge; Robert Sewallis Wayne, M.A. Cambridge; Edward Walker, B.A. Oxford; Charles James Ashmore, B.A. Oxford; Gregory Joachim Pogose, Oxford; John James Sims, Dublin; George Sumner, B.A. Oxford; the Hon. William Frederick Barton Massey, B.A. LL.B. Dublin; Henry Bruce Armstrong, B.A. Cambridge; William Arthur Tooke, M.A. Oxford; and Arthur Rowley William Lascelles, Esqrs.

MIDDLE TEMPLE.—John Arnell Creed, B.A. Corpus Christi College, (holder of an Exhibition awarded by the Council of Legal Education, Michaelmas Term, 1868); William Henry Clay (holder of a certificate of honour awarded by the Council of Legal Education, Michaelmas Term, 1868); John Letablere Litton, Dublin; George Harris Lea, M.A. Cambridge; William Bousfield, B.A. Oxford; Edward Edwin Pinches, B.A. London; Thomas William Brogden, B.A. Cambridge; William George Robinson, Oxford; Edwyn Thomas, M.A. Dublin; Archie Kirkman Lloyd; the Hon. Albert Dudley Ryder, B.A. Cambridge; Edward Rolland, M.A. LL.B. Edinburgh; Colin Campbell Grant, Edinburgh; Walter George Frank Phillimore, B.A. Oxford; and Edwin Lucas, Esqrs.

LINCOLN'S INN.—Benjamin Shaw, M.A. Cambridge; Thomas Francis Olliffe, LL.B. Cambridge; George Edward Brace; John Samuel Fletcher, B.A. Oxford; George William Heaton, B.A. Cambridge; Charles Bill, B.A. Oxford; George Hustler Tuck, B.A. Cambridge; William Talbot Agar, jun.,

B.A. Cambridge; Hugh Meredith Roberts, B.A. Cambridge; Charles Thomas Mitchell, M.A. Cambridge; John Houghton Swainson, M.A. Cambridge; Felix Thornley Cobbold, M.A. Cambridge; Thomas Hope McLachlan, B.A. Cambridge; Joseph Lister Godlee, B.A. London; Arthur Henry Forbes, B.A. Calcutta University; Joseph Walton, jun., B.A. London; Edward William Walker; Alfred Fraser Lingham; James Butler, King's College, London University; Greville Charles Douglas, Cambridge; and Charles Edward Brunskill Cooke, B.A. Cambridge, Esqrs.
GRAY'S-INN.—Alfred Rhodes Bristow, James Acworth Davies, and Robert Jardine, B.A. London, Esqrs.

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS.

NOTICES OF ADMISSION.

Hilary Term, 1869.

The clerks' names appear in small capitals, and the attorneys to whom articulated or assigned follow in ordinary type.)

ANDREWS, GEORGE, jun.—George Andrews, sen, Weymouth.
ATKINSON, WILLIAM FLETCHER.—William Busfield, Bradford.
BAIN, LEVETT.—William Matthews, Gloucester.
BLAKE, ALFRED STARLING.—Thomas Cousins, Portsea.
BLAKE, WALTER SCOTT.—Frederick Blake, Newport.
BLINKINSOP, JAMES, jun.—James Blinkinsop, Euston-station.
BLOUNT, ALFRED JOHN.—George Matthews Arnold, Milton-next-Gravesend.
BONIFANT, ROBERT HENRY.—Nathaniel Creswick, Sheffield; George Henry Blackwell, Sheffield.
BOWERMAN, RICHARD JOHN.—Richard Bowerman, Uffculme, Devon; John Bridges Nunn, 8, Old Jewry.
BOWLEY, THOMAS WILLIAM SALVIN.—William B. Paterson, Chancery-lane.
BREITELL, RICHARD.—William Nichols Maroy, Bowdley.
BRIERLEY, HENRY.—Robert Jackson, Rochdale.
BRODIE, GEORGE.—William Mark Fladgate, 10, Craven-street, Strand.
BROWN, THOMAS.—John Rogers Brown, Nottingham.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM GOLD.—Thomas Gold Edwards, Denbigh; Richard Pennington, 6, New-square.
CATHERRALL, EDWARD.—Charles Gammon, 9, Cloak-lane.
CHAMBERLAIN, WILLIAM HART.—Edward Hart Smith, 12, Clement's-inn.
CHEW, WILLIAM LAWRENCE.—Thomas Heath Chew, Manchester.
CHILD, THEOPHILUS.—Henry Child, 2, Paul's Bakehouse-court.
CIPRIANI, JOSEPH EMANUEL.—William Henry Cotterill, 32, Throgmorton-street.
COCK, HENRY.—Anthony Wellington Irwin, 6, Gray's-inn-square.
COMINS, THOMAS MELHUISE.—Thomas Melhuish Comins, sen, Witheridge.
CORBETT, NICHOLAS WILLIAM.—Frere & Co., 28, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
COX, EDWARD PARRY.—Holden & Sons, Hull.
DAVIES, SAMUEL RICHARD.—John Cooke, Chase, Ross.
DAVIES, SIDNEY EDMUND.—Henry Bernard, Wells.
DAVIES, WILLIAM ROBERT.—William Jones, Crosby-square; William H. G. Jones, Crosby-square.
DOBELL, ROBERT, jun.—Robert George Abraham, Ashburton; Richard C. Halse, Cheapside.
EVANS, JOHN ALBERT GRIFFITH.—Asa Johnes Evans, Cardigan; Charles Edward Abbott, 52, Lincoln's-Inn-fields; William Evans George, Newcastle Emlyn.
FALKNER, HENRY FREDERIC VALENTINE.—Henry Falkner, Louth.
FIDLER, WILLIAM ANTHONY.—John Nanson, Carlisle; Walter Boucher James, 23, Ely-place, Holborn.
FINNEY, JAMES.—James Greenhalgh, Bolton.
FUNSTON, JAMES.—Henry Webster, 10, Basinghall-street; George Edward East, Sion College-gardens, City.
GARDINER, EDWARD RICHARD.—Thomas Garnston Hyde, Worcester.
GREAVES, JOHN BROOK, jun.—Charles Leach Coward, Rotherham.
GREY, FRANK BACON.—John William Atkinson, Leeds; Thomas Townsend Dibb, Leeds.
GROVE, JOSEPH FRANCIS.—William Simmons Allen, Birmingham.
HARLEY, EDWARD ARTHUR.—Edward Harley, Bristol.

HAMPLIN, FREDERIC HARCOURT.—Walker and Martineau, 13, King's-road, Gray's-inn.
HARVEY, HERBERT CRANMER, B.A.—Edward Whitley, Liverpool.
HAWES, JAMES.—Francis Kearsy, 32, Bucklersbury.
HEKLE, JOHN ALCOCK.—Edward Waugh, Cockermouth.
HIRON, HENRY.—Henry Holland Burne, Bath.
HOOG, CHARLES GRANVILLE.—George Barnard Townsend, 3, Princes-street.
HUTCHINSON, EDWARD.—Robert Richardson Dees, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Arthur Lucas, Darlington.
JACKSON, HENRY JAMES.—Henry Hall, jun., Ashton-under-Lyne.
JAMES, EDWARD NUGENT.—James Trower Bullock, Purton, near Swinton.
JESSETT, CLAUDE.—William Gresham, 24, Basinghall-street.
JONES, FRANCIS WILLIAM.—Anthony Gilbert Jones, Gloucester.
KENNY, COURTNEY STANHOPE.—Edward John Rudd, late of Halifax; Adam & Emmet, Halifax.
KNOWLES, FREDERIC BELLIS.—George James Johnson, Birmingham; Isaac Knowles, Wellington.
LEE, CECIL RADFORD.—James Rogers, 7, Westminster-Chambers.
LEES, WILLIAM.—James Woods Weston, Manchester.
LITTLE, FREDERICK JOHN.—John Hett, Brigg.
MASON, CHARLES SAMUEL.—Henry Hewitt Mason, 18, Bedford-row.
MASTER, HARCOURT.—George Master, 22, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square; John James Johnson, 19, Southampton buildings, Chancery-lane.
MATTHEWS, PETER BARBON.—Harry Shoubridge, 1, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
MAYO, JOHN RYALL, jun.—John Ryall Mayo, sen, 33, Kennington-park-road.
MEEK, ALEXANDER GRANT.—Alexander Meek, Devizes; William Ford, 4, South-square.
MEEK, LIONEL ROBERT.—Alfred Grundy, Manchester; Joseph Woodcock, 14, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
MONRO, FREDERICK JOHN, B.A.—Frere & Co., 28 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
MORRIS, GEORGE.—Francis Fearon, 21, Great-George-street.
NICHOLSON, BECKITT.—George Pearson Nicholson, Wath-upon-Deane.
OSBORNE, HENRY JOHN.—Thomas Pinchard, Wolverhampton.
PARKER, GEORGE FRANCIS.—Benjamin Peverley, 71, Coleman-street, City; Francis Moon, 73, Coleman-street.
PARSON, ARTHUR GEORGE.—Thomas Johnson, Midhurst; Frederick John Blake, South-sea-house, Threadneedle-street.
PRICHARD, THOMAS.—William Frederick Blandy, Reading; Thomas Rawle, 1, Bedford-row.
PURVIS, PEREGRINE.—John James Andrew, 8, George-yard.
ROBINSON, JAMES FREDERICK.—James Robinson, 17, Ironmonger-lane, E.C.
SHEA, WILLIAM LEONARD.—St. Pierre Butler Hook, 9, Lincoln's-inn-fields; Henry Skipper Ryland, 14, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
SIMPSON, EDWARD GEORGE.—Joseph Dodds, Stockton-on-Tees.
SLOCOMBE, WILLIAM, jun.—William Slocombe, Reading; Edwin Freshfield, 5, Bank-buildings.
SOLOMON, SAMUEL NERWICK.—William Plummer, Bristol.
STODDON, JOHN COLE, B.A.—Frederick Clarke, St. Michael's Rectory, Cornhill.
STOREY, THOMAS PICKWORTH.—Robert Slaney, Newcastle-under-Lyne; William Cooper Tunstall; Edward Doyle, Verulam-buildings; Archibald S. Lawson, 31, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
STRONG, ROBERT DUNDAS.—Charles Underwood, 13, Holles-street.
TAHOUDIN, RENE JAMES.—Charles Tahourdin, Victoria-street.
THOMAS HAROLD.—Arthur Thomas, Sheffield.
THOMPSON, RICHARD PHILLIPS.—John Hunter, 9 New-square, Lincoln's-inn.
VAUGHAN, HOWARD WRIGHT JAMES.—Stephen Camp, 12, Paternoster-row.
VERNEDE, OSCAR.—William Jennings, 34, Lime-street.
WADDINGTON, WILLIAM GEORGE.—John William Danby, Lincoln.
WALTON, KEIGHLEY.—Edmund Minson Wavell, Halifax.
WILKINSON, PIERCY.—John Thomas Tweed, Lincoln.

WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, jun.—William Williams, Calverton.
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM PRESTON.—George Halcott Cooper, East
 Dereham; James Murray Dale, 3, Gray's-inn-square.
 WILLOUGHBY, GEORGE.—William Henry Cotterill 32,
 Throgmorton-street.
 WYNNE, LLEWELYN MALCOLM.—Llewelyn Wynne, 46,
 Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 YOUNG, ARTHUR.—Thomas Young, 29, Mark-lane.

Hilary Term, 1869, pursuant to Judge's Orders.

CROMPTON, HENRY DICKINSON.—Richard Enfield, Nottingham.
 HAINES, EDWARD.—Henry Darvill sen., Windsor.
 JUDGE, ARTHUR PERCIVAL.—Thomas Graham, 1, Mitre-
 court-chambers; Joseph Spencer Judge, 44, Parliament-
 street.

Hilary Vacation, 1869.

ARGYLE, EDWARD.—Thomas Argyle, Tamworth.
 BROAD, JAMES THIERRY.—William Henry Hallam, Bristol;
 Thomas Dix, Bristol.
 BROOK, WILLIAM HENRY.—John William Danby, Lincoln.
 COSTEKER, CHARLES.—George Dawes, 9 Angel-court.
 EDWARDS, HENRY THOMAS.—James Hilton, Hulme, Man-
 chester.
 MAPLES, ARTHUR STEWART.—Frederick Maples, 6, Frede-
 rick's-place, Old Jewry.
 PIGOTT, PELLING HUGH GOUGH.—Walker & M. , 13,
 King's-road.
 SKINNER, WILLIAM MOORE.—John Robinson, Sunderland;
 William Snowdon Robinson, Sunderland.

METROPOLITAN CRIME.

Sir Richard Mayne presents his compliments to the Editor of the *Times*, and requests he will have the goodness to cause the returns transmitted herewith to be published in the *Times*.

Much alarm appearing to have been excited by the repeated statements publicly made of the increase of crimes in the present year, Sir Richard Mayne thinks it will be useful for the purpose of allaying the alarm to make known the facts shown by these returns.

Metropolitan Police-office, Nov. 17.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Return of the number of burglaries within the Metropolitan Police District during six months, May to October inclusive, 1868, and number of apprehensions and convictions:—

No. of Burglaries Committed.	No. of Persons apprehended.	No. of Persons convicted.
199	99	69

Remarks.—Ten other persons not yet tried.

Return of the number of street outrages by day and also by night which have been committed within the Metropolitan Police District during six months, May to October inclusive, 1868, and number of apprehensions and convictions for these offences:—

	No. of Cases of		No. of Persons apprehended for		No. of Persons convicted for	
	Robbery with Violence.	Larceny from the Person of an Open or Aggravated Nature.	Robbery with Violence.	Larceny from the Person of an Open or Aggravated Nature.	Robbery with Violence.	Larceny from the Person of an Open or Aggravated Nature.
By day	10	16	15	12	9	5
By night.....	44	46	51	24	29	16

Note.—In these cases of street outrages, assaults on police, or other persons, arising from the ordinary disorderly quarrelling, excitement of drink, &c., are not included, but only those in which the object was robbery or larceny.

Similar returns for the same months of the years 1866 and 1867 are not prepared or kept in this office, but extracts from statistical tables for each of those years ending the 29th of September are shown in the attached return.

THOMAS KITTLE, Superintendent,
 Executive Branch, Commissioner's Office.
 Metropolitan Police-office, Nov. 14.

METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Extract from criminal statistical returns for years ending the 29th of September, 1866, 1867, and 1868, showing the comparative number of the crimes specified, of persons apprehended and committed for trial:—

Crimes.	Number of Crimes.			Number of Persons Apprehended.			Number Committed for Trial.		
	1866.	1867.	1868.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1866.	1867.	1868.
Burglary & house-breaking	330	474	428	225	252	258	190	217	224
Robbery in streets and highways.....	101	119	90	121	124	100	119	123	94
Attempts to rob ...	17	8	15	20	12	19	19	8	19
Total.....	448	601	533	366	388	377	328	348	337

The population in 1862 was 3,174,336, in 1866 3,396,664, and in 1868 3,507,828, estimated at ratio of increase for the ten years previous to last census of 1862.

The number of houses in 1862 was 429,382, in 1866 457,954, and in 1868 472,240, estimated at ratio of increase, &c., as above.

These returns are prepared for the Home-office and published annually.

THOMAS KITTLE, Superintendent,
 Executive Branch, Commissioner's Office.
 Metropolitan Police-office, Nov. 14.

COURT PAPERS.

COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

This Court will on Thursday the 26th, Friday the 27th, and Saturday the 28th days of November instant, hold sittings, and will proceed in disposing of the cases in the new trial, special, and Crown papers, and any other matters then pending; and will also hold a sitting on Thursday, the 17th day of December next, for the purpose of giving judgments only.

WINTER CIRCUITS OF THE JUDGES.

The following are the days and places fixed for holding the following circuits, viz:—

Mr. Justice BYLES.
 Warwick, Nov. 28; Derby, Dec. 3; Lincoln, Dec. 9;
 Leicester, Dec. 15; Northampton, Dec. 18.

Mr. Baron CHANNELL.
 Winchester, Dec. 4; Taunton, Dec. 11; Maidstone, Dec. 17; Sussex, Dec. 22.

Mr. Justice LUSH and Mr. Justice HAYES.
 Chester, Dec. 2; Manchester, Dec. 7; Liverpool, Dec. 15.
 At Chester Mr. Justice Lush will be the only judge.

Mr. Justice BRETT.
 Durham, Dec. 5; Newcastle, Dec. 10; York, Dec. 12;
 Leeds, Dec. 16.

LANCASHIRE WINTER ASSIZES, 1868.

NOTICE.

The commissions for holding these assizes will be opened at Manchester, on Monday, the 7th of December, and at Liverpool on Tuesday, the 15th of December.

By an order made by the judges at the last Liverpool spring assizes, "for facilitating the entry of causes for trial at future assizes for the southern division of this county, and for the more convenient arrangement of the business of such assizes"—

"It is (amongst other things) ordered as follows:—
 "Causes for trial at Manchester and Liverpool respectively may be entered provisionally at the office of the acting prothonotary and associate at Preston on such days previous to the commencement of each assizes, as may by the acting prothonotary and associate be appointed in that behalf."

"For the purpose of the entry, lists shall be prepared with such numbers in the margin thereof, from one upwards, as the acting prothonotary and associate may consider likely to approximate to the number of causes to be entered for trial."

"Persons entering causes either provisionally or otherwise shall be at liberty to enter at any number which may be vacant."

"Causes entered provisionally shall stand in the list as actually entered for trial unless withdrawn before the com-

menacement of the entry on the commission day of the assizes. No cause which shall be withdrawn shall be re-entered without leave of the Court or a judge."

"Unless otherwise ordered by the Court or a judge, no cause shall be entered at the foot of any list to be prepared as aforesaid until all the numbers therein shall have been filled up, and if it shall happen when the entry is closed that any of the numbers shall not be filled up, the acting prothonotary and associate shall number the causes consecutively from the first to the last."

In pursuance of the above order, causes for trial at Manchester and Liverpool can be entered provisionally at the office of the prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas at Lancaster at Preston, as follows, viz: Causes for trial at Manchester, on Wednesday, the 2nd of December, and daily thereafter, until Saturday, the 5th of December inclusive, between the hours of ten o'clock in the forenoon, and one o'clock in the afternoon; and causes for trial at Liverpool, on Wednesday, the 9th of December, and daily thereafter until Saturday, the 12th of December inclusive, between the above-mentioned hours.

The entry of causes at Manchester and Liverpool respectively will commence at the Assize Courts, Manchester, and St. George's Hall, Liverpool, immediately after the opening of the commissions, and will close at nine o'clock in the evening on the commission day.

The Court will sit at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, at Manchester and Liverpool respectively, on the day next following the commission day.

The trial of special jury causes will commence at Manchester, at 10 o'clock a.m., on Friday, the 11th of December, and at Liverpool, at 10 o'clock a.m., on Saturday, the 19th December, and not earlier, unless the Court shall otherwise order.

A list of causes for trial at Manchester and Liverpool respectively each day (except the first) will be exhibited in the corridor of the court and in the library.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

LAST QUOTATION, Nov. 20, 1868.

(From the Official List of the actual business transacted.)

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

5 per Cent. Consols, 34	Annuities, April, '85
4 per Cent. Account, Dec., '94	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
5 per Cent. Reduced, 52½	Ex Billa, £1000, per Ct. 20 p m
New 5 per Cent., 92½	Do, £500, Do 20 p m
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan., '94	Do, £100 & £300, 20 p m
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan., '94	Bank of England Stock, 4 per
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan., '94	Ct. (last half-year) 246
Annuities, Jan., '80 —	Do for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. 74, 217½	Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p Ct. Jan., '79 105½
Do for Account	Do, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 111
Do 5 per Cent., July, '80 115½	Do Debentures, per Cent.,
Do for Account, —	April, '64 —
Do 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 103	Do Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 105
Do, ditto, Certificates, —	Do Bonds, 5 per Ct., £1000 12 p m
Do Enforced Fpr., 4 per Cent. 91½	Do, ditto, under £1000, 16 p m

RAILWAY STOCK.

Shres.	Railways.	Paid.	Closing prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	78
Stock	Caledonian	100	75½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	92
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	42½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	84
Stock	Great Northern	100	105½
Stock	Do., A Stock	100	105
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	97
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	80½
Stock	Do., West Midland—Oxford	100	25
Stock	Do., do., Newport	100	31
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	128½
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	49
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	17½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	113½
Stock	London and South-Western	100	88
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	47½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	107
Stock	Midland	100	112½
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	80
Stock	North British	100	33½
Stock	North London	100	123
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	58
Stock	South Devon	100	45
Stock	South-Eastern	100	79½
Stock	Do., Deferred	100	40½
Stock	Taff Vale	100	148

* A receives no dividend until 5 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The funds have been dull and declining this week; some large sales set them moving downwards, and the depressing force was kept up by anticipations of future complications in the East, coupled with the shipment of one million in bullion for Russia. Railway securities opened with much firmness, which, however, they have not maintained. Foreign securities have also been dull. At last, after remaining for sixteen months at 2 per cent., the Bank rate of discount has been raised to 2, and it is anticipated that the next few months will witness a rise to 3½.

On Wednesday the students just called to the Bar attended as usual at Westminster to take the oath and sign the roll. Some among them suggested, however, that the oath should be omitted, and Lush, J., having consulted with his brethren, informed them that the oath might be dispensed with. This was in consequence, of course, of the late Act. Having obtained this, the students inquired about the usual fees of 4s. 6d., supposing that if this sum was charged for taking the oath, they need not now pay it. There appeared, however, some one with a vested interest in this money, and the conclusion arrived at was, that each barrister must pay 2s. 6d. for the roll only.

A few days since a wag wrote and placed the following pretended rule of court in the court-room of one of our courts of record, where the rules of practice were wont to be posted: "Whenever any attorney shall frequent saloons as a habit, and cannot be found at his office, if he has any office, it shall be necessary for such attorney to file with the clerk of the court a list of the saloons so frequented by him; and notice of any motion left at such saloon or saloons shall be considered as sufficient notice to such attorney of any motion in a case pending in this court." A certain attorney who loved a social glass, and was in the habit of frequenting a certain saloon in the city more than his office, seeing this notice and supposing it to be genuine, left word with the clerk that he could be found at the saloon of —. Judge of the surprise of the aforesaid attorney on the following day, when he moved the Court, under the above rule, to reinstate an important case of his that had been dismissed in his absence, on the ground that no notice had been left at the saloon where he had been waiting the whole of the day before, and was informed by the good-natured judge, with a smile, and amid roars of laughter from the entire Bar, that the rule was a hoax.—*Chicago Legal News.*

In entitling litigations to which the State is a party, e.g. nuisance, revenue, and other cases, the lawyers (or printers) of the United States couple with the title of the Commonwealth the description, not of the opposing party, but of the subject-matter of the litigation. Not unfrequently the juxtaposition of ideas thus produced has a very ludicrous effect for a reader not used to this method. For instance, in a recent number of the *American Law Register* we find reported an excise case, the title of which, as it appears on the top of each page is—*United States v. Six Fermenting Tubs.*

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BROWNE—On Nov. 17, at 9, Porchester-square, the wife of T. L. Murray Browne, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.
CASTLE—On Nov. 12, at 67, St. Augustine-road, Camden-square, the wife of Edward James Castle, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.
LANE—On Nov. 12, at The Lawn, Rugby, the wife of John Lane, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.
ROSE—On Nov. 1, at Montreal, Canada, the wife of William Rose, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.
WILKINSON—On Nov. 13, the wife of Walter M. Wilkinson, Esq., of Kingston-on-Thames, of a daughter.
YOUNG—On Nov. 13, the wife of Charles Vernon Young, Esq., Solicitor, of Arbour-square, Stepney, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

BOYLE—BUTTERWORTH—On Nov. 10, at the Parish Church of Instow, North Devon, Charles Boyle, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of the Inner Temple, to Mary Jane, daughter of the late James Schofield, Esq., of Brook-house, Rochdale, and widow of the late Henry Butterworth, Esq., of Southport.

DEATHS.

BACON—On Nov. 14, at Brighton, Henry Bacon, Esq., of the Middle Temple.
KNIGHT—On Nov. 9, at Tamworth, William Knight, Esq., Solicitor.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Wind-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Nov. 13, 1868.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Arri Marble Company (Limited).—Creditors are required, on or before Dec 9, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Negretti, Hatton-garden. Monday Dec 21, at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the said debts and claims.

Dorchester Antelope Hotel Company (Limited).—By an order made by Vice-Chancellor Malins, dated Nov 6, it was ordered that the above Company be wound up; and it was ordered that Alfred Good be appointed Official Liquidator. Sykes, Founder's-hall, solicitor for the petitioners.

Liverpool Marine Credit Company (Limited and Reduced).—Petition for reducing the capital from £200,000 to £100,000, presented May 25. Any person who claims to be a creditor of the Company; and who is not entered on the list and claims to be so entered, must, on or before Nov 20, send in his name and address, and the particulars of his claim, to Lacey & Co, Lpool, solicitors for the Company.

Lily Quarries Slate and Slab Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated Nov 6, ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above Company be continued. Kent, Mitre-chambers, Temple, solicitor for the petitioners.

Oxfordshire and Berkshire Assured Bread Company (Limited).—Petition for winding-up, presented Nov 12, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Giffard on Nov 21. Linklaters & Co, Walbrook, solicitors for the petitioners.

United Service Company (Limited).—Petition for winding-up, presented Nov 12, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls, on Nov 21. Gadsden & Troherne, Bedford-row, solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, NOV. 17, 1868.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Bristol Soap and Trading Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Nov 7, ordered that the above Company be wound up. Whites & Co, Budge-row, Cannon-st, solicitors for the petitioner.

Caterham Gas Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Nov 7, ordered that the above Company be wound up. Girdwood, Old Jewry-chambers, solicitor for the petitioners.

Debroogurh Tea Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated Nov 6, ordered that the voluntary winding up of the above Company be continued. Snell, George-st, Mansion-house, solicitor for the petitioner.

Dewbury United Brickmaking and Building Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Nov 9, ordered that the above Company be wound up, and appointed Charles Henry Marriott, Dewbury, Official Liquidator. Ridsdale & Craddock, Gray's-inn, solicitors for the petitioners.

Diaderi & Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated Nov 16, appointed William Turquand, 16 Tokenhouse-yard, to be Official Liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Dec 5, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Wednesday, Dec 16, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Imperial Hotel Company, Dover (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Nov 7, ordered that the above Company be wound up. Bailey, Tokenhouse-yard, solicitor for the petitioner.

Kennet Paper Making Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Malins has, by an order dated Nov 6, ordered that the voluntary winding-up of the above Company be continued. Chapple, Carter-lane, solicitor for the petitioner.

Old Westminster Mining Company (Limited).—Petition for winding-up, presented Nov 17, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart, on the first petition day in December. Brandon, Essex-st, Strand, solicitor for the petitioners.

Poole and Cherbourg Steam Packet Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Nov 7, ordered that the above Company be wound up. Ford Arundel-st, Strand, solicitor for the petitioner.

Ulster and Meron Railway Company (Limited).—Petition for winding-up, presented Nov 14, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Giffard, on Nov 25. Houghton & Wragg, St Helen's-pl, Bishopsgate-st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Watlington Gas Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Nov 7, ordered that the above Company be wound up. Girdwood, Old Jewry-chambers, solicitor for the petitioners.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

International Life Assurance Society.—Petition for winding-up, presented Nov 14, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Malins, on the first petition day in December. Tucker, St Swithin's-lane, solicitor for the petitioner.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, NOV. 13, 1868.

Refuge Life and Sick Friendly Society, Astley-st, Dukinfield, Chester. Nov 11.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, NOV. 13, 1868.

Bishop, John Richd, Prospect-pl, Jamaica Level, Bermondsey, Gent. Dec 10. Bishop & Pearce, M. R.

Bunning, Fredk Geo, Doncaster, York, Upholsterer. Dec 3. Brooke & Ellis, V. C. Malins.

Castle, Harriet, Cliff Lodge, South-fields, Wandsworth, Widow. Dec 20. Nash & Castle, M. R.

Hutton, John, Warnford-st, Gent. Dec 20. Hutton & Hutton, M. R.

TUESDAY, NOV. 17, 1868.

Adames, Thos Bridger, Chichester, Yeoman. Dec 31. Adames & Ballett, V. C. Giffard.

Kellaway, Stephen, Lea Green, Southampton, Yeoman. Dec 31. Clarke & Hooper, V. C. Giffard.

Shearwood, John, Sharrow, York, Gent. Dec 10. Hobson & Roberts, M. R.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, NOV. 13, 1868.

Atherton, John, Weston-in-Gordano, Somerset, Builder. Jan 1. Hobbs & Peters, Bristol.

Bain, Jas, Old Compton-st, Soho, Gent. Dec 18. Mercer & Mercer, Mincing-lane.

Balmain, Joseph, Prospect-pl, Maida-hill, Esq. Jan 1. May, Golden-sq.

Birrell, John Hy, Kingswood-hill, Gloucester, Minister. Jan 1. Hobbs & Peters, Bristol.

Bull, Wm, Bristol, Gent. Jan 1. Hobbs & Peters, Bristol.

Carr, Geo, Dotland-pk, Northumberland, Gent. Jan 1. Baty, Hexham.

Crosier, Wm Pearson, Freshwater, Isle of Wight, Captain R.N. Jan 1. Moore & Co, Lynton.

Grove, Lucy, Carlton-hill, St John's-wood, Spinster. Jan 1. Porter, Victoria-st, Westminster.

Hunt, Sarah, Burhall, Suffolk, Widow. Dec 24. Hayward & Son, Needham-market.

Huson, Mary, Norwich, Spinster. Dec 31. Keith & Co, Norwich.

Kirby, Richd, Swanland, York, Builder. Jan 1. Wilson, Kingston-upon-Hull.

Laward, Wilmam Mark Anthony John, Folkestone, Esq. Dec 19. Stuart & Baly, Gray's-inn-sq.

Lewis, Robt, Somersham, Suffolk, Farmer. Dec 24. Hayward & Son, Needham-market.

Love, Edw Missenden, Barnet, Hertford, Esq. Jan 10. Burgoyne & Co, Oxford-st.

Marsh, Sir Hy, Victoria-sq, Pimlico, Bart. Dec 1. Reeves & Sons, Dublin.

Miller, Thos Brooke, Loughborough, Leicester, Esq. March 1. Giles, Loughborough.

Palmer, Chas, Gloucester-rd, Croydon, Dec 16. Earle, Bedford-row.

Peat, Edw, Nottingham, Gent. Dec 28. Watson & Wadsworth, Nottingham.

Peel, Joseph, Manoh, Iron Founder. Feb 10. Thorley & Robinson, Manoh.

Targett, Wm, High-st, St Giles-in-the-fields, Undertaker. Jan 1. May, Golden-sq.

Tovey, Richd, Birm, Painter. Dec 31. Wood, Birm.

Trotman, Wm, Whitcross-st, Southwark, Boiler Maker. Jan 1. Terrell & Chamberlain, Basinghall-st.

Williams, John Frydderch, Rhyl, Flint, Clerk. Jan 1. Williams, Rhyl, Deponport.

TUESDAY, NOV. 17, 1868.

Barton, Wm Ludlam, Brompton-rd, Gent. Dec 15. Jones, Crosby-sq.

Browning, Joseph Hinde, Wrington, Somerset, Dissenting Minister. Dec 15. Terrell & Chamberlain, Basinghall-st.

Byers, Wm Gilborn, Devonport, Devon, Printer. Dec 21. Sole & Gill, Deponport.

Cliffe, Joseph, Bay Hall, nr Huddersfield, Brewer. Dec 14. Milnes, Huddersfield.

Green, Elis, Claremont-pl, North Brixton, Widow. Dec 31. Green, Worthing.

Green, Philip, Claremont-pl, North Brixton, Esq. Dec 31. Green, Worthing.

Habbajan, Robt, Lpool. Jan 1. Ley & Scott, Carey-st, Lincoln's-inn.

Hardy, Alfred, Victoria-rd, Surbiton, Builder. Jan 5. Bell & Newman, Abchurch-lane.

Harrison, Rev Thos, Barham, Kent. Dec 31. Prideaux, Goldsmiths'-hall.

Higginson, Thos, Preston, Lancaster, Hosier. Dec 31. Pilkington & Walker, Preston.

Langman, Thos Harvey, Pickering-ter, Paddington, Hosier. Jan 1. Vallance & Vallance, Essex-st, Strand.

Liebert, Siegfried Adolph, Manch, Merchant. Feb 14. Allen, Manch.

Lory, Wm, Stoke Damery, Devon, Esq. Dec 21. Sole & Gill, Devonport.

Louch, Eliza Ann, Little Moorfields, Spinster. Dec 21. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury.

Mayhew, Geo, Earl Stotham, Suffolk, Farmer. Dec 24. Hayward & Son, Needham-market.

McDougall, Eliza Bickford, Larkbeare, Devon, Widow. March 25. Truscott, Exeter.

Mewburn, Hy, Down Ampney, Gloucester, Gent. Dec 21. Sole & Gill, Devonport.

Preston, Isaac, Gt Yarmouth, Norfolk, Esq. Jan 2. Preston, Gt Yarmouth.

Quick, Virtue, Bristol, Widow. Dec 21. Parnell & Salt, Bristol.

Russell, Esther Rebecca, Evelyn-st, Deptford, Widow. Dec 14. Walker & Son, Swithin's-lane.

Thomas, Lucy, Upper Forchester-st, Paddington, Widow. Dec 21. Woodroffe & Plaskitt, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, NOV. 13, 1868.

Ashby, Arthur, St Mary-axe, Grocer. Oct 14. Asst. Reg Nov 10.

Cawthray, Wm, Leeds, Draper. Oct 14. Asst. Reg Nov 11.

Chalmers, Wm Robt, St Mary-at-hill, Wine Merchant. Nov 3. Comp. Reg Nov 12.

Chamberlain, Chas, Church-st, Greenwich, Butcher. Oct 27. Comp. Reg Nov 9.

Clarke, Jeremiah, Nottingham, Joiner. Nov 3. Comp. Reg Nov 13.

Clayards, Wm, Conway-mews, Fitzroy-sq, Cab Proprietor. Nov 6. Comp. Reg Nov 10.

Deacon, Wm Edw Durand, Prisoner for Debt, Winchester. Nov 2. Comp. Reg Nov 13.

Edwards, Jas, Coleford, Gloucester, Draper. Oct 13. Asst. Reg Nov 10.

Emery, Saml Harvey, Kingston-upon-Hull, Draper. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Nov 11.

Faraday, Saml Peter Tertius, Birm, Brush Manufacturer. Oct 20. Comp. Reg Nov 12.

Goltman, Solomon, Kingston-upon-Hull, Tobacconist. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Nov 11.

Haigh, Wm, Honley, York, Manufacturer. Oct 20. Asst. Reg Nov 11.

Holdway, John, Weston, Somerset, Baker. Nov 6. Asst. Reg Nov 12.

Hutchinson, Ann, Manch, Stationer. Oct 28. Comp. Reg Nov 11.

King, Geo, Ardwick, Manch, Oil Merchant. Oct 26. Asst. Reg Nov 12.

Lake, Simon Heay, Bideford, Devon, Grocer. Nov 4. Comp. Reg Nov 12.

Littleford, Wm Osborn, Myddleton-st, Clerkenwell, Jeweller. Nov 7. Comp. Reg Nov 10.

Maltby, John, Landport, Southampton, Outfitter. Oct 14. Comp. Reg Nov 11.

Morgan, Saml, & Chas Brown, High-st, Notting-hill, Drapers. Oct 29. Comp. Reg Nov 10.

Page, Wm Bishop, Gt Malvern, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Sept 18. Asst. Reg Nov 12.

Parson, Wm Hodgson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant. Oct 22' Asst. Reg Nov 10.
Rogey, Isaac, Forebridge, Stafford, Grocer. Oct 20. Comp. Reg Nov 12.
Stern, John Chas, Gt Grimsby, Lincoln, Watchmaker. Oct 16. Comp. Reg Nov 11.
Tobias, Joseph, & Davis Tobias, Wood-st, Spitalfields, Boot Manufacturers. Oct 14. Comp. Reg Nov 10.
Treble, Saml, Leeds, Tea Dealer. Oct 8. Asst. Reg Nov 12.
Youngusband, John & John Newborne, Gateshead, Durham, Drapers. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Nov 11.

TUESDAY, Nov. 17, 1868.

Allen, Wm Adam, Preston, Lancaster, Cotton Spinner. Oct 17. Asst. Reg Nov 14.
Atkinson, Fredk Arthur, Driffield, York, Ironmonger. Oct 12. Asst. Reg Nov 13.
Barstow, Saml, Halifax, York, Dealer in Scouring Liquor. Oct 22. Asst. Reg Nov 16.
Beardmore, Saml, Leek, Stafford, Blacksmith. Oct 24. Asst. Reg Nov 14.
Boucher, John, Bridgwater, Somerset, Bootmaker. Oct 27. Comp. Reg Nov 14.
Crown, John Berkeley, Carnaby-st, Regent-st, Clerk. Oct 31. Comp. Reg Nov 14.
Davies, Benj Thos, Potton, Bedford, Tailor. Oct 19. Asst. Reg Nov 13.
Edwards, Ezekiah, Southgate-grove, Southgate-rd, De Beauvoir-town, Kingsland, Stationer. Nov 11. Asst. Reg Nov 16.
Grime, Wm, Scarborough, York, Builder. Oct 7. Asst. Reg Nov 12.
Holland, Wm Chas, Southampton, Grocer. Nov 4. Comp. Reg Nov 16.
Marshall, Thos, Sheffield, Lead Dealer. Oct 31. Comp. Reg Nov 16.
Morley, Geo, Banbury, Oxford, Carpenter. Oct 15. Asst. Reg Nov 16.
Mundy, Wm, & Jas Hutchinson, Wanstead, Essex, Builders. Oct 23. Inspectorship. Reg Nov 16.
Myers, Moss, Hart-st, Wood-st, Dealer in Beads. Nov 9. Comp. Reg Nov 13.
Pattison, Stephen, Otley, York, Provision Dealer. Oct 21. Comp. Reg Nov 14.
Rayson, Joseph, Birm, Licensed Victualler. Oct 21. Asst. Reg Nov 13.
Roberts, Robt, Tyn-y-Coed, Carnarvon, Farmer. Oct 23. Asst. Reg Nov 16.
Shearer, Stephen, Leeds, Potted Meat Manufacturer. Oct 8. Asst. Reg Nov 14.
Taylor, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant. Oct 21. Comp. Reg Nov 16.
Wade, Geo, Halifax, York, Shoemaker. Nov 9. Asst. Reg Nov 13.
Walklate, Geo, Bermondsey New-road, Earthenware Dealer. Oct 30. Comp. Reg Nov 16.
Walton, Wm, Grassington, York, Grocer. Oct 10. Comp. Reg Nov 14.

Bankrupts.

To Surrender in London.

FRIDAY, Nov. 13, 1868.

Adams, Chas Fredk, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 11. Roche. Nov 25 at 1. Chandler, Bucklebury.
Albrecht, Peter, Cornwall-rd, Lambeth, Baker. Pet Nov 9. Nov 30 at 12. Briant, Winchester-st, Old Broad-st.
Beele, John, Richmond-rd, West Brompton, Builder. Pet Nov 7. Nov 30 at 11. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Brotherton, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 3 (for pau). Pepps. Nov 26 at 12. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Cohen, Hy, Portpool-lane, Leather-lane, Holborn, Dealer in Iron. Pet Nov 10. Pepps. Nov 26 at 2. Waring, Bond-st, Walbrook.
Collingbourne, Fredk Hy, High-st, Wandsworth, Pawnbrokers. Pet Oct 31. Pepps. Nov 24 at 1. Spyer & Son, Winchester-house, Old Broad-st.
Corney, Chas, King-st, Hammer-smith, Carpenter. Pet Nov 11. Nov 30 at 1. Pittman, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.
Cumner, Eliza, Prisoner for Debt, Gloucester. Adj Nov 9. Murray. Nov 25 at 12.
Du Troncy, Louis, Gainsford-st, Kentish-town, out of business. Pet Nov 9. Pepps. Nov 26 at 12. Harrison, Basinghall-st.
Dyer, John, Arlington-st, Camden-town, out of business. Pet Nov 10. Pepps. Nov 26 at 1. Walker, Guildhall-chambers.
Eckert, Geo David, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 10 (for pau). Brougham. Nov 30 at 1. Gostley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.
Ellis, John Thos, Somerset-pl, High-st, Merton, Grocer. Pet Nov 9. Nov 30 at 12. Pittman, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.
Elliott, Edmund Parrott, Henry-st, Kennington, Comedian. Pet Nov 10. Pepps. Nov 26 at 1. Ditchman, Margaret-st, Cavendish-sq.
Elmstone, Christopher Thos, Charwood-st, Pimlico, Shipowner. Pet Nov 10. Pepps. Nov 26 at 1. Crump, Philpot-lane.
Emmerson, Matthew Wm, Brentford-end, Isleworth, Sail Manufacturer. Pet Nov 9. Roche. Nov 23 at 1. Woodbridge & Son, Cliffrids-lan.
Ferguson, Fras, Hoxton-sq, Old-st, Marble Mason. Pet Nov 10. Pepps. Nov 26 at 1. Hicks, Strand.
Gauntlett, Fras, Holme, Nuthurst, Sussex, Manager of a Farm. Pet Nov 9. Roche. Nov 23 at 2. Vyner, Cook's-ct, Lincoln's-inn.
Hearn, Hy, Ebury-st, Pimlico, Hair Dresser. Pet Nov 6. Nov 25 at 2. Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Hollis, Hy, Brooks-st, Commercial-rd, Greocer. Pet Nov 10. Nov 30 at 12. Presse, Old Jewry-chambers.
Homes, Wm Paul, Morton-rd, Islington, Assistant to a Boot Manufacturer. Pet Nov 11. Pepps. Nov 26 at 2. Dobie, Gresham-st.
Hudson, Geo Edwd, Beaufort-gardens, Brompton, Banker. Pet Nov 3. Roche. Nov 23 at 1. Hunter & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.
King, Wm, York-rd, Wandsworth, Stone Mason. Pet Nov 9. Pepps. Nov 26 at 12. Davis, Harp-lane, Cannon-st.
Lloyd, Richd, Cannon-st, Director of the Kennet Paper Making Company. Pet Nov 10. Roche. Nov 25 at 12. Hoppe & Boyle, Sun-ct, Cornhill.
McClarty, Wm Jas, Bankside, Southwark, Carman. Pet Nov 11. Roche. Nov 25 at 1. Neale, Kennington-pk-rd.
Pearce, Robt, Bulmer-ter, Nottning-hill, out of business. Pet Nov 10. Roche. Nov 25 at 12. Barton & Drew, Fore-st.

Phillips, Moses, Aldershot, Southampton, Watchmaker. Pet Nov 10. Nov 30 at 1. Lott, Parliament-st.
Pilditch, Wm Smith, St Paul's-ter, Camden-town, Carpenter. Pet Nov 9. Pepps. Nov 26 at 12. Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Prince, Alex, & Alex Chas Montague Prince, Trafalgar-sq, Charing-cross, Comm Agents. Pet Nov 11. Pepps. Nov 26 at 2. Chidley. Old Jewry.
Russell, John, Tachbrook-st, Pimlico, Theatrical Manager. Pet Nov 9. Roche. Nov 25 at 11. Roberts, Moorgate-st.
Saward, Jas, Durham-st, Hackney-rd, out of business. Pet Nov 9. Roche. Nov 25 at 11. Watson, Basinghall-st.
Solater, Jas, Sloane-ter, Chelsea, Solicitor's Clerk. Pet Nov 10. Roche. Nov 25 at 1. Jones, New-inn, Strand.
Scrutton, Jabez, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Cabinet Maker. Pet Nov 6. Pepps. Nov 24 at 2. Badham, Queen-st, Cheapside.
Sears, Thos Housson, Dartford, Kent, Farmer. Pet Nov 10. Roche. Nov 25 at 12. Russell & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Smith, Wm, Frating, Essex, Farmer. Pet Nov 9. Nov 30 at 11. Jones, Colchester.
Thomas, Fredk Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Maidstone. Adj March 20. Dec 2 at 11.
Timpson, Alfred, Lamb-ct, Spitalfields, Licensed Victualler. Pet Nov 10. Nov 30 at 12. Briant, Winchester-st, Old Broad-st.
Turner, Chas Hamilton, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 10 (for pau). Pepps. Nov 26 at 1. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Valette, Marcel, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 10 (for pau). Roche. Nov 24 at 1. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Wisher, Chas, Pitt-st, Commercial-rd, Builder. Pet Nov 7. Nov 30 at 11. Jenkinson & Son, Corbet-ct, Threadneedle-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Baker, Hy Jones, Clifton, Bristol, Saddler. Pet Nov 9. Wilde. Bristol, Nov 25 at 11. Henderson & Salmon, Bristol.
Bennell, Jas, Essex, Chelmsford, out of business. Pet Nov 7. Barnes. Colchester, Nov 28 at 12. Digby, Maldon.
Billson, Abraham, Rugby, Warwick, Grocer. Pet Nov 10. Hill. Birm, Dec 2 at 12. Overall, Leamington.
Carman, Benj, Prisoner for Debt, Chelmsford. Adj Oct 17. Chapman. Harwich, Dec 1 at 3. Jones, Colchester.
Chesworth, Jas, Lpool, Estate Agent. Pet Nov 11. Lpool, Nov 26 at 12. Wilson, Lpool.
Church, Edwd, Norwich, Draper. Pet Nov 11. Palmer. Norwich. Nov 25 at 11. Stanley, Norwich.
Dickinson, Wm, North Collingham, Nottingham, Boot Maker. Pet Nov 9. Newton. Newark. Nov 25 at 12. Ashley, Newark.
Dunn, Fredk, Whitstington, Stafford, Innkeeper. Pet Nov 9. Harward. Stourbridge, Nov 27 at 16. Wall, Stourbridge.
Dutton, Joseph, Birm, Grocer. Pet Nov 10. Guest. Birm, Dec 11 at 10. Powell, Birm.
Firn, Geo, Leicester, Stone Engraver. Pet Nov 7. Leicester, Dec 12 at 10. Haxby, Leicester.
Foster, Jas, Leeds, Plasterer. Pet Nov 10. Marshall. Leeds, Nov 26 at 12. Hardwick, Leeds.
Ganderton, John, Birm, Fruiterer. Pet Nov 11. Guest. Birm, Dec 11 at 10. Rowlands, Birm.
Hall, Geo, Wormald-green, York, Farmer. Pet Nov 12. Leeds, Nov 30 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.
Hulton, Hy, Hyde, Chester, Joiner. Pet Nov 10. Fardell. Manch. Nov 24 at 11. Hibbert, Manch.
Hickman, Robt, Gt Malvern, Worcester, Tailor. Pet Nov 10. Tudor. Birm, Nov 27 at 12. Piper, Ledbury.
Horton, Geo, Lincoln, Hairdresser. Pet Nov 6. Uppleby, Lincoln. Nov 23 at 11. Hex, Lincoln.
Johnson, Wm, Kirk Andrew-on-Eden, Camberland, Cattle Salesman. Pet Nov 9. Gibson. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Nov 24 at 12. Hoyle & Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Johnstone, John, Leicester, Comm Agent. Pet Nov 10. Ingram. Leicester, Dec 12 at 10. Haxby, Leicester.
Kerslake, Thos, Ottery St Mary, Devon, Licensed Victualler. Pet Nov 9. Exeter. Nov 24 at 12. Flood, Exeter.
Long, David, Hunstanton, Norfolk, Carpenter. Pet Nov 10. Part-ridge. King's Lynn, Nov 24 at 11. Nurse, King's Lynn.
Maggi, Louis, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker. Newport, Nov 20 at 12. Lewis, Cheapside.
Marks, David, & Moses Marks, Prisoners for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker. Lewes, Nov 27 at 12.
Martin, Fredk, Kingston-upon-Hull, Nurseryman. Pet Nov 11. Leeds. Nov 24 at 12. Rolitt, Hull.
Martin, Robt, Lpool, Contractor. Pet Nov 11. Lpool, Nov 6 at 11. Norris & Sons, Lpool.
Parsons, Joseph, Brighton, Sussex, House Agent. Pet Nov 11. Ever-shep. Brighton, Nov 30 at 11. Runnacles, Brighton.
Parton, Thos, Stottesdon, Salop, Machinist. Pet Nov 4. Trow. Cleobury Mortimer, Nov 25 at 10. Rowlands, Birm.
Pascoe, Stephen, Camborne, Cornwall, Van Proprietor. Pet Nov 3. Peter. Redruth, Dec 8 at 11. Holloway, Redruth.
Peigot, Marins, Louis, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker. Lewes, Nov 26 at 12. Barrow, Fish-ct-hill.
Pidding, Edwd Bourne, & Joseph, Iredale, Prisoners for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker. Nov 27 at 12. Murray, Gt St Helens.
Raphael, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker. Lewes, Nov 26 at 12. Lewis, Cheapside.
Sandry, Mary Williams, St Astell, Cornwall, Dealer in China. Pet Nov 9. Carlyon. St Austell, Nov 27 at 12. Meredith, St Austell.
Saunders, Wm Jacob, Ilford Bridges, Somerset, Dairyman. Pet Nov 11. Sparks. Crewkerne, Nov 21 at 10. Paull, Ilminster.
Saywell, Edwin, New Radford, Nottingham, Lace Warper. Pet Nov 11. Patchitt. Nottingham, Dec 23 at 10.30. Bask, Nottingham.
Schade, Fredk Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker. Lewes, Nov 27 at 12.
Sewell, Nathaniel, Seabridge Farm, near Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Farmer. Pet Nov 6. Tudor. Birm, Nov 27 at 12. Tennant, Hanley.
Sharrool, Edwin, Stafford, Teacher of Music. Pet Nov 9. Spillbury. Stafford, Nov 26 at 11. Bowen, Stafford.
Smith, Robt, Coaley, Gloucester, out of business. Pet Nov 9. Anderson. Stroud, Nov 24 at 11. Witchell, Stroud.

Speed, Robt, Fiskerton, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet Nov 11. Uppelby.
Lincoln, Nov 23 at 11. Harrison, Lincoln.
Bunting, Jeremiah, Gorleston, Suffolk, Licensed Victualler. Pet Nov 7.
Chamberlin, Gt Yarmouth, Nov 34 at 12. Wiltshire, Gt Yarmouth.
Susman, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau). Blaker.
Lewes, Nov 26 at 11.
Thirkettle, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 6 (for pau).
Blaker. Lewes, Nov 26 at 12. Lamb, Brighton.
Thornhill, John, Poole, Dorset, Fruiterer. Pet Nov 11. Dickinson.
Poole, Nov 23 at 3. Tanner, Wimborne.
Wagner, Emil David, Prisoner for Debt, Lewes. Pet Nov 9 (for pau).
Blaker. Lewes, Nov 27 at 12. Murray, Gt St Helens.
Ward, Edwd, Bolton, Lancaster, General Broker. Pet Nov 9. Holden.
Bolton, Nov 26 at 10. Ramwell, Bolton.
Welch, Chas Jas, Springbourne, Southampton, Painter. Pet Nov 11.
Draitt, Christchurch, Nov 26 at 11. Sharp, Christchurch.
Weller, Geo, Blackgang, Isle of Wight, Common Carrier. Pet
Nov 10. Blake, Newport, Nov 25 at 11. Beckingsale, Newport.
Bitwam, John, Milnesbridge, Huddersfield, Flock Merchant. Pet
Nov 12. Leeds, Nov 30 at 11. Mosely, Huddersfield.
Dill, Danl, Penrith, Cumberland, Potatoes Dealer. Pet Nov 10.
Warty, Feurth, Nov 26 at 10. Graham, Penrith.
Wiltshire, Wm, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, out of business. Pet
Nov 3. Wilde. Nov 25 at 11. Benson & Elletson, Bristol.

To Surrender in London.

TUESDAY, Nov. 17, 1868.

Anthony, Redmond Campbell, Peter's-st, St Martin's-lane, Artist. Pet
Nov 14. Pepsys. Dec 3 at 1. Pittman, Stamford-st, Lambeth.
Blinks, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 12. Pepsys. Dec 3
at 12. Ball, New Broad-st.
Brooke, Augustine Hy, Burdett-row, Bow, Schoolmaster. Pet Nov 11.
Nov 30 at 2. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Bunger, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 14 (for pau). Brough-
am. Dec 2 at 1. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Butlin, John, Milton-st, Dorset-sq, Journeyman Harness Maker. Pet
Nov 13. Murray. Nov 30 at 12. Allen & Son, Carlisle-st, Soho-sq.
Chapman, Wm, Hy, Union-ter, Union-rd, Southwark, Clerk. Pet Nov
13. Murray. Nov 30 at 11. Hicklin, Trinity-sq, Borough.
Clinton, Arthur Pelham, Southampton-st, Strand, no occupation. Pet
Nov 12. Murray. Nov 30 at 12. Roberts, Moorgate-st.
Cunningham, Geo, Elizabeth-st Hackney-rd, out of business. Pet Nov
14. Murray. Nov 30 at 12. Beard, Basinghall-st.
Eve, Arthur, Alexandra-ter, Sunnyside-rd, Horseay-rise, Brewer's
Agent. Pet Nov 12. Murray. Nov 30 at 11. Riches, Cheapside.
Fletcher, Geo, Fleet-st, Police Constable. Pet Nov 12. Dec 2 at 12.
Wheatley, Symond's-inn, Chancery-lane.
Fowler, Wm Richd, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 6. Dec 2 at
12. Pittman, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.
Gardner, Robt, Church-rd, Battersea, Corn Chandler. Pet Nov 12.
Pepsys. Dec 3 at 11. Levy, Surrey-st, Strand.
Gibson, Thos Salmon, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 14 (for pau).
Brougham. Dec 2 at 1. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Gibson, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 14 (for pau). Murray.
Nov 30 at 12. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Handley, Alex Chas, Russell-st, Vassel-rd, North Brixton, Commer-
cial Traveller. Pet Nov 12. Nov 30 at 2. Willett, Gray's-inn-sq.
Howard, Hilton, Bloomsbury-sq, Optician. Pet Nov 10. Nov 30 at 1.
Watson, Basinghall-st.
Lucas, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 11 (for pau). Pepsys.
Dec 3 at 1. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Medlock, Wm, Queen's-cres, Kentish-town, Undertaker. Pet Nov 12.
Murray. Nov 30 at 11. King, Birchin-lane.
Moore, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Poole. Adj Nov 9. Pepsys. Dec
3 at 11.
Sams, John Richd, Piccadilly, Oil Warehouseman. Pet Nov 13. Murray.
Nov 30 at 11. Hancock & Co, Carey-st, Lincoln's-inn.
Seager, Geo Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 10 (for pau).
Brougham. Nov 30 at 2. Biddles, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Smith, Edwin, sen, & Edwin Smith, jun, Fagg Farm, Sussex, Farmers.
Pet Nov 3. Dec 2 at 1. Cooke & Talbot, Raymond-bldgs, Gray's-
inn.
Thomas, Chas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Nov 11 (for pau). Pepsys.
Dec 3 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.
White, John, Webber-st, Southwark, Baker. Pet Nov 13. Dec 2 at 12.
Rigby, Basinghall-st.
Wilson, Frances Ellen, Fulham-rd, Dealer in Fancy Goods. Pet Nov
13. Pepsys. Dec 3 at 12. Haines, Gt Marlborough-st.
Woodrow, Wm Johnson, Palatine-pl, Stoke Newington-rd, Commercial
Traveller. Pet Nov 13. Pepsys. Dec 3 at 12. Cooke, New Broad-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Barrett, Charlotte, Halifax, York, Milliner. Pet Nov 12. Rankin.
Halifax, Nov 27 at 10. Barstow & Son, Halifax.
Bates, Edwd, West Gorton, Lancaster, Builder. Pet Nov 6. Fardell.
Manch, Dec 1 at 11. Hulton & Lister, Salford.
Baxter, John, Lpool, out of business. Pet Nov 10. Lpool, Nov 27 at
12. Bellringer, Lpool.
Bowles, Robt, Redmister, Bristol, Chemist. Pet Nov 11. Harley.
Bristol, Dec 4 at 12. Benson & Elletson.
Bradshaw, Wm, Wigan, Lancaster, Provision Dealer. Pet Nov 11.
Part. Wigan, Dec 3 at 9. Richardson & Co, Bolton.
Briggs, Wm, Workington, Cumberland, Paper Manufacturer. Pet Nov
12. Gibson. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Dec 2 at 12. Watson, Newcastle-
on-Tyne.
Brooks, Wm, jun, Blackburn, Lancaster, out of business. Pet Nov
14. Fardell. Manch, Dec 1 at 12. Hobbie & Senl.
Brooks, Wm, Burnley, Lancaster, Pinmaker. Pet Nov 9. Fardell.
Manch, Nov 30 at 11. Cobbet & Co, Manch.
Bryant, Wm Way, Upway, Dorset, Tea Dealer. Pet Nov 13. Andrews.
Weymouth, Dec 1 at 11. Day, Bridport.
Bunting, Robt, York, Hotel Keeper. Pet Nov 14. Leeds, Dec 7 at
11. McLaren, York.
Buttle, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Lincoln. Adj Nov 9. Bell. Bourn,
Dec 2 at 12.
Castles, Joseph, Tealby, Lincoln, Schoolmaster. Pet Nov 10.
Rhodes. Market Rasen, Dec 2 at 4. Haddelsey, Caistor.

Eastwood, Frank, Osett, York, Warehouseman. Pet Nov 12. Nelson.
Derby, Dec 3 at 3. Iberson, Dewsbury.
Ellis, Oliver, Silcoates, York, Scribbler. Pet Nov 16. Leeds, Dec 7
at 11. Stokes, Wakefield.
Eguson, John, Wolverhampton, Gas Engineer. Pet Nov 12. Birm.
Nov 27 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Fendell, Hy, York, Provision Dealer. Pet Nov 7. Perkins, York.
Nov 30 at 11. Grayston, York.
Fitzgerald, Geo, Aldershot, Hants, Tailor. Pet Nov 13. Holles.
Farnham, Nov 27 at 12. Geach, Guildford.
Harries, Wm, Lampeter, Licensed Victualler. Pet Nov 23. Owen.
Narberth, Dec 3 at 10. Lascelles, Narberth.
Harris, Edwd, Chilterne St Mary, Wilts, Shoemaker. Pet Nov 7. Pont-
ing. Warminster, Nov 25 at 12. Wakeman, Warminster.
Hartmann, Albert, Bournemouth, Southampton, Professor of Music.
Pet Nov 12. Draitt, Christchurch, Nov 26 at 11. Sharp, Christ-
church.
Heywood, John, Oldham, Lancaster, Carter. Pet Nov 12. Tweedale.
Oldham, Dec 2 at 12. Ashcroft, Oldham.
Hulbert, Wm Olive, Gloucester, Innkeeper. Pet Nov 12. Wilton.
Gloucester, Nov 28 at 12. Cooke, Gloucester.
James, Jan, Prisoner for Debt, Monmouth. Adj Nov 10. Wilde. Bristol,
Nov 27 at 11. Clifton, Bristol.
Jepson, John, Derby, Grocer. Pet Oct 20. Weller. Derby, Dec 9 at
12. Briggs, Derby.
Kaeser, John Jas, Birm, Watch Maker. Pet Nov 5. Hill. Birm, Dec
2 at 12. Rowlands, Birm.
Levens, Wm Robinson, Middleton, Lancaster, Joiner. Pet Nov 12.
Fardell. Manch, Nov 30 at 12. Storer, Manch.
Libbiss, Jas, Gt Yarmouth, Norfolk, Licensed Victualler. Pet Nov 13.
Chamberlin. Gt Yarmouth, Dec 1 at 12. Diver, Gt Yarmouth.
Masse, Joseph, Salford, Lancaster, Baker. Pet Nov 10. Fardell.
Manch, Nov 30 at 12. Storer, Manch.
Massey, John, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Stafford, Grocer. Pet Nov 9.
Slaney, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Nov 28 at 11. Litchfield, Newcastle-
under-Lyne.
Moss, Saml, Manch, Grocer. Pet Nov 14. Macrae. Manch, Dec 4 at
12. Jones, Manch.
Mullock, Fredk, Burslem, Stafford, Retail Butcher. Pet Nov 11. Chal-
linor. Hanley, Dec 19 at 11. Ward, Longton.
Robinson, John, Leeds, Estate Agent. Pet Nov 16. Leeds, Nov 30 at
11. Pullan, Leeds.
Samuel, Israel, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Pet Nov 12. Hime.
Lpool, Nov 27 at 3. Parker, Lpool.
Sharman, Hy, Ellesmere, Salop, Builder. Hill. Pet Nov 13. Birm.
Dec 2 at 12. Blackburn, Ellesmere.
Spencer, Jas, Walsingham, Nottingham, Farmer. Pet Nov 12.
Burton Gainsborough, Nov 28 at 11. Bromley, Lincoln.
Stagg, Adolphus, Sheffield, Fife Manufacturer. Pet Nov 16. Leeds,
Dec 2 at 12. Smith & Burdick, Sheffield.
Taylor, Wm, Wigfoot, Lincoln, Licensed Victualler. Pet Nov 11.
Staniland. Boston, Nov 26 at 10. Bailie, Boston.
Trueman, Chas, Wm, Ruswarp, York, Jet Ornament Manufacturer.
Pet Nov 12. Buchanan. Whitby, Nov 28 at 11. Hindmarsh.
Whitby.
Turner, Robt, Newmarket St Mary, Suffolk, Eating-house Keeper. Pet
Nov 11. Botton. Newmarket, Nov 28 at 10. York, Newmarket.
Wakefield, Obed, Cheltenham Gloucestershire, Fly Proprietor. Pet
Nov 13. Gale. Cheltenham, Dec 1 at 11. Stroad, Cheltenham.
Walker, Thos, Redcar, York, Blacksmith. Pet Nov 12. Crosby.
Stockton-on-Tees, Dec 2 at 11. Griffin, Redcar.
Walters, Wm, Miles, Lpool, Artists' Colourman. Pet Nov 12. Lpool,
Dec 2 at 11. Barker, Lpool.
Warne, Wm Geo, Stapleton, Gloucester, Schoolmaster. Pet Nov 14.
Wilde. Bristol, Nov 28 at 11. Henderson & Salmon, Bristol.
Wellstead, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, Gloucester. Adj Nov 9. Wilde.
Bristol, Nov 27 at 11.
Wills, John, Wootkey Hole, Wells, Carpenter. Pet Nov 13. Lovell.
Wells, Nov 30 at 12. Hobbie & Senl.
Woodward, Thos, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, out of business. Pet
Nov 11. Hubbert. Burton-upon-Trent, Nov 25 at 10. Wilson,
Burton-upon-Trent.
Wool, Richd Thos, Downton, Wilts, Retiring Officer. Pet Nov 13.
Wilson. Nov 27 at 3. Bartrum, Bath.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Nov. 13, 1868.

Miller, Wm, Rushley-green, Lewisham, Builder. Nov 11.
Simonds, Chas, Exton-rd, Builder. Nov 4.
Wates, Jas, jun, Powis-st, Woolwich, Stationer. Nov 12.

TUESDAY, Nov. 17, 1868.

Watts, Alfred Bullock Baghott, Hursipierpoint, Medical Practitioner.
Nov 17.

GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON, E.C.

SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Pro-
posals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life
Interests, or other adequate securities.

Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following
form:—

PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....
Introduced by (State name and address of solicitor)
Amount required £
Time and mode of repayment (i.e., whether for a term certain, or by
annual or other payments)
Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or build-
ings, state the net annual income)
State what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the
Gresham Office in connexion with the security.

By order of the Board,

F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.